

THE MONTHLY REPOSITORY

AND

REVIEW.

NEW SERIES, No. XLIX.

JANUARY, 1831.

DR. J. P. SMITH'S SCRIPTURE TESTIMONY TO THE MESSIAH.*

DR. J. P. SMITH'S "Scripture Testimony to the Messiah," is a work which has attained to the highest reputation, not only within the pale of the particular sect to which the author belongs, but amongst all classes of believers in the doctrines of reputed orthodoxy. It is certainly to be ranked amongst the ablest defences of those doctrines which have ever appeared. Learned, ingenious, and laborious, it deserves the attention of all who are interested in the great controversy to which it relates : and if the irresistible tendency of the system he defends, and the perverting prejudices to which it gives occasion, have led the author often to treat his opponents with great real injustice, there are also indications of kind feelings, and of a desire to act towards them with candour and Christian meekness, which may with many persons give more weight to his censures, rendering them, when founded in error or misrepresentation, more dangerous, if not more offensive.

It has been a special object with Dr. Smith to furnish a reply to the "Calm Inquiry" of Mr. Belsham, and it is in reference more particularly (though by no means exclusively) to this object, that we now propose to examine his volumes—not that we would hold up Mr. Belsham's work as faultless either in plan or execution—not, certainly, that we consider the great body of Christians who adopt the sentiments he defends, as answerable for the mistakes into which he may have fallen or the improper spirit which he is accused of having manifested—but his work being honestly esteemed by us an able and satisfactory treatise on a very important subject, written under the influence of an enlightened, disinterested, and impartial love of truth ; and the effect it has produced upon the minds of many intel-

* The Scripture Testimony to the Messiah : an Inquiry with a view to a satisfactory Determination of the Doctrine taught in the Holy Scriptures concerning the Person of Christ. By John Pye Smith, D. D. 3 Vols. 8vo. 2nd. Edit. London, 1829.

ligent and sincere inquirers being well known to us, we were anxious to satisfy ourselves respecting a laboured attack upon it coming from an individual who stands so high both as to character and attainments as Dr. Smith : and having long since fully satisfied ourselves, we think it seasonable at this time, when our venerated friend has been taken from among us, and his work, in consequence of the very small number of copies remaining, may perhaps for the present have its circulation somewhat restrained, to call the attention of our readers to the true state of the controversy, and assist them in judging how far Dr. Smith has succeeded in invalidating Mr. Belsham's arguments, or in otherwise defending the prevailing doctrine respecting the person of our Lord.

Dr. Smith's work is divided into four books, of which the first is occupied with preliminary considerations ; the second is "On the Information to be obtained concerning the Person of the Messiah from the Prophetic Descriptions of the Old Testament ;" the third, "On the Information to be obtained concerning the Person of the Christ from the Narratives of the Evangelical History, and from our Lord's own Assertions and Intimations ;" and the fourth, "On the Doctrine taught by the Apostles in their Inspired Ministry concerning the Person of the Lord Jesus Christ." This distribution of the subject may probably be the most natural and useful for the impartial student, who, as he meets with each passage which may have a possible bearing on the point he is investigating, will refer to lexicographers, scholiasts, and commentators, without distinction of party or opinion, and having obtained all the aids he can, will form his own independent judgment. But where the object proposed is to set before our readers the *results* of our inquiries, and to compare these results with those obtained by others, we cannot help thinking that such an arrangement as Mr. Belsham's (who collects and examines in order the texts which have been adduced in support of each point of disputed doctrine) is more clear and satisfactory, as well as more favourable to conciseness. We do not think it the best method for the instruction of students, yet we were hardly prepared for the following remarks from any one possessing the least share of judgment or candour :

"The selection and arrangement of texts was certainly, so far as it went, a suitable means ; provided a due regard were had to the studying of each in its proper place and connexion. But to throw down before a company of inexperienced youths a regular set of rival and discordant expositions, 'in general without any additional, or at least doctrinal, comment of the compiler's own,' appears to me to have been a method not well calculated to lead into the path of convincing evidence and well-ascertained truth. It might excite party feeling, wordy disputation, unholy levity, and rash decision : but so far as either from the theory of the case or from experience I am able to form a judgment, I could not expect a better result, except in rare instances indeed."—*Scripture Testimony*, Vol. I. Chap. vi. p. 160, second edition.

On what grounds is it here insinuated that, under Mr. Belsham's guidance, a *due regard was not had to the connexion of texts*, in defiance of his own rule on the subject : "In order to judge of the true sense of a disputed text, it is necessary to consider the connexion in which it stands" ? (*Calm Inquiry*, Introd. p. 3, 2d ed.) So long as important passages of Scripture are differently understood by men of learning, who are able each to give some plausible reasons in favour of his own interpretation, what can the honest and impartial instructor do but lay before his pupils, or, in Dr. S.'s phraseology, "throw down before a company of inexperienced youths,"

a set of rival and discordant expositions? Or how would this be avoided by changing the plan of treating the subject from Mr. B.'s to Dr. Smith's, or to any other that may be suggested? A theological lecturer is certainly not bound to suppress the expression of his own opinions in his class; and provided that his pupils are prepared not to be the passive recipients of his sentiments, but to reflect on all that is laid before them, and draw conclusions for themselves, it is reasonable and natural that they should have the benefit of his thoughts on the subject before them, as well as those of others: but whilst he faithfully executes the duty of opening to them the existing sources of information, his own opinion cannot be essential, and there may be circumstances in which it is much better for him not to bring it forward at all. If Mr. Belsham had added doctrinal comments of his own, we may be sure that he would now be accused of having attempted unduly to bias the minds of his pupils. If the fair statement of whatever has been said most important on each side of a disputed question, be not "a method well calculated to lead into the path of convincing evidence and well-ascertained truth," we must presume that the plan preferred is making known only what has been said on one side; or, if they cannot be concealed, accompanying the arguments on the other side with such depreciating comments as may effectually prevent their receiving any real attention. Why the demand for profound and impartial thought on the most important topics of human inquiry, that which might be supposed to have, of all possible employments, most tendency to sober the mind and impress it with a feeling of solemn responsibility, should be judged likely to excite "party feeling, wordy disputation, unholy levity, and rash decision," is what we cannot understand, nor can we conceive how the *prerequisites* for the successful study of the Scriptures demanded by Dr. Smith in the passage immediately following that which we have quoted, should appear to him to be opposed to the views of his rival, or to be any thing different from what every theological instructor, whatever might be his peculiar opinions, must desire to find amongst those whose studies he is called upon to direct.

Guided by the arrangement of Dr. Smith's work, we shall now apply ourselves to notice such portions of it as the limits within which this article must necessarily be confined, will allow us to select for animadversion; and we must begin by exposing the sophistry of the first chapter, entitled, "On the Evidence proper to this Inquiry:"

"We cannot," says Dr. S., "reasonably doubt of the UNITY of God, in every sense in which unity is a perfection: but to the exact determination of that sense we are not competent. A manifest unity of intelligence, design, and active power, does not warrant the inference that *unity* in all respects, without modification, is to be attributed to the *Deity*. For any thing that we know, or are entitled to presume, there may be a sense of the term *unity* which implies restriction, and would be incompatible with the possession of all possible perfection."—P. 10.

We ascribe *unity* to the Deity. Unity is a word—a significant sound—a sound significant (like all words) only from the power of association, and having no sense inherent in itself which may remain unknown to those acquainted with its ordinary usage. It is not like many words, the notions corresponding to which in different minds are very different: on the contrary, the meaning it conveys, on all other subjects besides the one now under consideration, is definite, clear, and universally agreed upon. Why then do we employ it upon this subject? Either our meaning is the same as when we apply the same term to other subjects, or we use the word in a

loose sense to express some resemblance or approximation to the usual one, or we use it without any distinct meaning at all. It is very possible to use a word without meaning, as part of a formula which we have been early taught, and which, without having been reflected upon, is associated, as a whole, with certain notions of sanctity and duty; but we manifestly cannot so use a word as the result of our own observations or inquiries: it cannot, therefore, be in this manner that we ascribe unity to the Deity from the study of his works. Neither is it in the loose sense, for when we reason from unity of intelligence, design, and active power, to unity of mind, and therefore of being, the argument may or may not be conclusive; but it has no meaning, no existence whatever, if we change the sense of the term. It is plain, then, that the unity of the Deity, as a doctrine of *natural religion*, (whether established by sufficient evidence or not,) is unity in the obvious sense of the term, and is opposed to plurality of persons, hypostases, or distinctions, of whatsoever kind, in the Divine Nature.

After some farther argument on our ignorance of the essence and mode of existence of the Deity, Dr. Smith proceeds to say,

"These remarks have been made with a view to shew that there is *no antecedent incredibility* in the supposition, that the infinite and unknown essence of the Deity *may* comprise a plurality—not of separate beings—but of hypostases, subsistencies, persons; or, since many wise and good men deem it safest and most becoming to use no specific term for this ineffable subject,—of distinctions; always remembering that such distinctions alter not the unity of the Divine Nature. For any thing that we know, or have a right to assume, this may be one of the *unique* properties of the Divine Essence; a necessary part of that Sole Perfection which must include every real, every possible excellence; a circumstance peculiar to the Deity, and distinguishing the mode of His existence from that of the existence of all dependent beings."

Now we have shewn that so far as the argument *from Nature* for the Divine Unity is good for any thing, (we will not press it as conclusive,) it is an argument for Unity, in the obvious and usual sense of that term, excluding and opposed to all plurality. No one can say that any appearance of Nature sanctions the doctrine which is contended for; and from the philosopher to the savage, no one possessing the use of his reason, ever heard it proposed for the first time, or first applied himself to study it, without feelings of surprise and of repugnance. It is hardly then too much to say, that there must exist in every unprejudiced mind a *justifiable indisposition* towards its reception—an indisposition which may indeed be overcome by evidence, but which must require to overcome it evidence *clear, direct, consistent, and abundant*. We are called upon to admit this notion of plurality in unity on the authority of *revelation*, whilst, inconsistently enough, we are told in the same breath that it cannot be understood. It is represented that we may conceive it *possible* that there *may be* a sense of the term *Unity* consistent with such plurality as exists in the Divine Nature, though the term Unity is an arbitrary sign, unmeaning, except as it excites by association a certain notion in the minds of those who hear it; and the notion which it thus represents is, with equal correctness, represented by the phrase "absence of plurality;" that is to say, we might as consistently affirm existence and non-existence of the same thing, at the same time, as unity and plurality: yet every attempt at rendering the ideas at all compatible is proscribed as heresy. We cannot even know what to call the distinctions in the Divine Nature: if we use the common term persons, we must consider that term as having a

special but inexplicable sense; if we substitute any other word, we must equally remember that it is the sign of an idea, never possessed by any human mind, and is to us an unmeaning sound, or only reminds us at most of the existence of a mystery which we can never hope to penetrate. All this of a doctrine of *revelation*, a doctrine *revealed*, i. e. made known. *What* made known? Is it the necessity of using a certain form of words? Even thus the principal orthodox terms are not Scriptural—but no! prescription of words is not revelation. There must be something for the understanding to embrace, and by meditation on which the practical benefits of *truth* or knowledge may be obtained. It is senseless to talk of that being revealed, which does not even remain unintelligible, but in respect to which we are obliged to substitute language which excites inconsistent and utterly irreconcilable ideas for the confession of ignorance. It is vain to refer us to the mysteries of Nature and Providence, and the incomprehensibility of all the Divine perfections. We are, indeed, blind and feeble-minded, and it would be strange if finite beings could fully comprehend the attributes or works of Him who is infinite; but on all these subjects what we think that we know is intelligible and practically useful, what remains mysterious is so confessedly, and does not mock us with the pretence of being revealed in language which is either unmeaning or contradictory.

It cannot then be thought unreasonable to insist that there is a strong *antecedent improbability* attending the doctrine of the Trinity. For our own parts, so completely are we convinced of the sufficiency of the evidence for the Jewish and Christian revelations, and so deeply are we impressed with a sense of the importance of these dispensations to mankind, that whatever is proved from the records to be a genuine part of them we will submissively receive, and if we cannot understand it, we will believe that our *profession* of it is to do some good; but we neither can nor ought to resist the feeling that peculiarly strong and clear evidence is necessary to support a doctrine such as this: nor, if persons who were fully satisfied that no trace of it is to be found in the records of the Divine communications have spoken of its absurdity and utter impossibility, can such language with any appearance of justice be attributed to impiety or contempt of revelation. We do not, however, justify such language; what we have said has been merely in reply to Dr. Smith's attempt to set aside all antecedent improbability. We are persuaded that Unitarian Christians act most wisely in meeting the question simply as a Scriptural question. Other views of the subject may appear to them very striking, but they acknowledge the Sacred Records as the guides of their faith, and, firmly convinced that the Trinity is not taught or implied in them, they are anxious, in the first place, fairly and candidly to discuss that point with those who maintain the contrary position.

The next passage upon which we feel ourselves compelled to remark, and which is an example of the treatment Mr. Belsham uniformly receives from Dr. Smith, is the note (A) to Chapter III. which we must quote at length:

“No writer can be more prompt to appeal to the original text than the author of the *Calm Inquiry*; and for this, when reason and truth warrant the appeal, let him be commended. But a case happens in which the error of the Authorized Version affords a semblance of support to the Unitarian cause: and then he can argue from the *very inaccuracy* of the translation, with as comfortable a confidence as could be felt by the most illiterate of those lay-preachers, upon whom, on another occasion, he has poured unsparing contempt. (See a Letter to Lord Sidmouth, by the Rev. Thomas Belsham, 1811) This case is one in which, with a view to neutralize the passage, ‘In him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily,’ (Col. ii. 9,) he brings an

alleged instance of the application of similar language to Christians generally: 'In the Epistle to the Ephesians, chap. iii. 19, the Apostle prays that they *may be filled with all the fulness of God*, i. e. with knowledge of the Divine will, and conformity to the Divine image.' P. 252.—But the Apostle's expression is, 'that ye may be filled *unto* all the fulness of God;' suggesting the sublime conception of an approximation to the Supreme perfection, which is begun by religion now, and shall be ever growing in the holiness and bliss of the future state; while the infinity of distance must for ever remain between Deity and the creature. This palpable error is retained in the text of the 'Improved Version,' and the true rendering is barely mentioned in a note with this vapid and silly interpretation—i. e. 'that ye may be admitted into the Christian Church.' As if the community of Ephesian Christians, which had flourished so many years in full organization (Acts xx.) and eminent stability (Ephes. i. 13—15), was not yet to be regarded as a part of the Christian Church!"

Now it happens, notwithstanding what we must call the bitterness of invective in this note, that the common version of Ephes. iii. 19, is not a *palpable error*, and was manifestly adhered to by Mr. Belsham, whether rightly or not, from conviction after examination. It will be sufficient for us to quote Dr. Bloomfield's note:

"In the interpretation of these words, the commentators, as on many other occasions, exceedingly differ. But, as often, the most natural, simple, and extensive application will be found the best. Now, as the Apostle had been speaking of the immense and inconceivable love of God and Christ, so here (I assent to Grotius, Whitby, Crellius, and Macknight) he means to say that by thus attaining the Holy Spirit, and having suitable conceptions of the great mystery of Redeeming love, they may be filled with all the spiritual gifts and blessings, both ordinary and extraordinary, that God can and will impart to his faithful worshippers. 'Εὐς is put for εὐ; than which nothing is more frequent in Scripture. Compare infra iv. 10, and Col. i. 9."—Bl. Reconsio Synoptica, Vol. VII. p. 581.

This distinguished scholar, and the eminent critics whom he here follows, will, in the estimation of most persons, at least protect Mr. Belsham from the charges of retaining a *palpable error*, and ignorantly or unfaithfully arguing from the *inaccuracy* of a translation. In the Improved Version, it seems, Dr. Smith's *true rendering* is barely mentioned in a note, (two different translations, however doubtful the case, can hardly be both introduced into the text—one must be placed in a note, or else neglected,) with a *vapid* and *silly* interpretation. We will only say this interpretation is that of Schleusner, (in verb. πληρωμα, No. 7,) to whom Mr. Belsham refers; and no competent judge—no one who examines his references and reflects on what he says—will treat it with contempt, even if he should be induced ultimately to reject it.

We must now quote a paragraph from the fourth chapter, "On the Errors and Faults, in relation to this Controversy, attributable to Unitarian Writers," which, for its uncandid and illiberal spirit, we have hardly seen surpassed, even in the course of our attention to the Unitarian controversy:

"It has appeared to me," says Dr. S., "that one of the distinguishing failings of the Unitarian theology is a propensity to generalize too soon, and to conclude too hastily, both in criticism and in argumentation. It seems the habit of its advocates to assume a few of the broadest facts in the scheme of Christianity, which are obvious to the most rapid glance: and, with a sweeping hand, they either crush down all the rest, and leave them unregarded, or they force them into an unnatural and disfiguring subordination to the favourite assumptions. Unlike the cautious and patient spirit of true philoso-

phy, which is always open to the collection and the careful estimation of facts, and which regards nothing as more hostile to its objects than a precipitate and foreclosing generalization, the Unitarian spirit rather resembles that of the old scholasticism, which spurned laborious investigation and slow induction, and would force all nature into its ranks of predicaments and predicables. This may be one reason, among others, why these notions meet with so ready an acceptance in young minds, inexperienced, flirty, and ambitious, half-learned, and ill-disciplined. Here is a theology easily acquired, discarding mysteries, treading down difficulties, and answering the pleas of the orthodox with summary contempt: a theology complimentary to the pride of those who deem themselves endowed with superior discernment, and which in practice is not ungenerously rigid against any favourite passion or little foible that is decently compatible with *the world's* code of morals."

We suppose we must expect Dr. S. to speak slightly of our mode of reasoning, since he so little likes our conclusions, and we are very willing to leave our logic to its own defence; but we will venture, though the same thought will occur to most of our readers, to illustrate the character of mind—*young, inexperienced, flirty, and ambitious, half-learned, and ill-disciplined*—to which our doctrines have been found acceptable, by naming Milton, Newton, Locke, Lardner, Priestley—and Whitby and Watts, as the last resting-place of their minds, at the close of lives devoted to religious inquiries. We are tempted to enumerate others distinguished for their great attainments, their powers of mind, the prejudices with which they had to struggle, or the sacrifices they made to what they believed to be the truth, but it is needless. Dr. S. may have seen that Unitarianism recommends itself to *young* minds, ardent in the pursuit of truth, *ambitious* of being distinguished in promoting it, too *inexperienced* to be influenced by motives of worldly wisdom, not yet having their own thoughts lost and buried in a mass of ill-digested *learning*, too *ill-disciplined* to suppress as criminal the doubts which inquiry may suggest—and he forgets that the same views have satisfied the matured judgment of those whose fame he cannot injure, have been entertained with the fullest conviction by those whose genius, learning, and virtues, he cannot prevent the better part of mankind from admiring. We will not stop to compare Dr. S.'s own confidence in his superior discernment with our recollections of what we have seen manifested by Unitarian writers; but when our theology is described as "in practice not ungenerously rigid against any favourite passion or little foible that is decently compatible with the **WORLD'S** code of morals," we are called upon to reject the calumny; we are entitled to express the disgust with which it affects us. We ask first, what there is in the doctrines of Unitarian Christianity which should make their professors indulgent to sinful passions, and ready to conform their standard of duty to the merely prudential requisitions of the worldly-minded and irreligious? Like others, they are taught that they are constantly under the eye of an all-seeing God, perfect in holiness and purity, who has made known to them their duty, and who will *one day bring every work into judgment with every secret thought*. Is it then because they believe that this all-perfect Being has given them laws, not for his own glory, but for their happiness, and that the strict observance of these laws is essential to their attainment of any real or permanent good? Is it because they are assured that sin and suffering are inseparably connected, and that a death-bed repentance is vainly relied upon to avert the consequences of a life of wickedness? Is it because they are taught that they must "*work out THEIR OWN salvation with fear and trembling*," and have not learned to put their trust in another's merits? Is it because, whilst they rely on

their heavenly Father and Friend mercifully accepting their faithful endeavours to perform their duty, to correct their faults, and to improve their characters, they feel certain that no rational hope can be founded on any thing less than earnest and prevailing endeavours to do right, accompanied by honest self-examination, sincere repentance of known faults, and constant efforts after improvement? On account of which of these characteristic doctrines is it that they should be judged likely as a body, rather than other professing Christians, to make light of the evil of sin, to find excuses for the indulgence of bad passions, and to join themselves with those who, thinking only of present pleasure, make the decencies of society, not the rules of duty, the standard by which they regulate their conduct?

We ask, again, are Unitarian Christians in fact distinguished from those amongst whom they live by being less strict in the government of their own appetites, less honest and liberal in their dealings with others, less kind and charitable towards their suffering fellow-creatures? We know that they are not generally thought so by those who differ from them most widely in sentiment. They are often, through misapprehension of their opinions, accused of relying on their good works, but seldom of any remarkable deficiency in performing them. We have no disposition to praise them highly. We lament that they do not come nearer to what, with their advantages, might reasonably be expected. We would to God we could see them more deeply imbued with their professed principles, and more uniformly acting as becomes their high and holy calling; but we cannot silently allow them to be unjustly and uncandidly condemned. We well know that the faults with which they are chargeable are not effects of their religious principles, but consequences of these not being cherished and felt as they deserve to be: and as the language of Dr. Smith has forcibly reminded us of those whom we have known most truly under the influence of the peculiar religious sentiments in which we rejoice, most firmly convinced of their truth, and most constantly applying them in practice—of those whose pure minds, elevated affections, warm and habitual piety, strict integrity, and active benevolence, have been to our conceptions a genuine and glowing representation of the Christian life—of some who yet remain to edify and bless their friends—of others who have already found their faith triumphant over death, and have closed their pilgrimage as became those who had spent it in preparation for that better world, of which through the gospel of Jesus they entertained an assured expectation—that language has appeared to us so inexcusably unjust, so entirely founded in culpable ignorance and prejudice, and dictated by so arrogantly censorious a spirit, that whilst we appeal from his judgment, we cannot help reminding him of the responsibility under which he has passed sentence upon us.

In his fifth chapter, Dr. S. makes somewhat more particular charges against the conduct of Unitarians, which, that we may not have to return to the subject, we shall here notice. He accuses them of being generally, “so far as station and circumstances afford opportunities,” devoted to “all the forms of gay amusement and fashionable dissipation;” of neglecting the ordinances of religion, and of not honouring the Lord’s-day. With respect to the first of these charges, we cannot tell what Dr. Smith may have seen, but from pretty extensive opportunities for observation, we feel ourselves warranted in giving the opinion, that the members of Unitarian congregations (meaning, of course, those who are of a rank to be within reach of the temptation) *generally* partake very moderately in the gaieties of life, and are not justly chargeable with dissipation. It is true they do not think every

thing which has the name of pleasure criminal, and consider it as a point of duty to abstain from it ; they do not affect that peculiar austerity which is so frequently characteristic either of the bigot or the hypocrite ; but we should describe them as concerning themselves little with the follies of fashion, entering very moderately into scenes devoted to amusement, pursuing the quiet walks of business, of social duty, and of innocent social enjoyment.

There is, however, no sect which exhibits any thing approaching to uniformity of excellence among its members : each has many connected with it who are considered by the better part as doing no credit to the principles they profess, and being by no means truly under their influence. Now, it should be observed that Unitarianism, as understood by the majority of its professors, not attaching to the externals of religion the same essential and inherent importance with most other systems, and affording no inducements to hypocrisy, a thoughtless devotion to the gaieties of the world is just the fault into which our less worthy and serious members are apt to fall ; not to mention that there are many partially connected with us, who, though disbelieving the doctrines of reputed Orthodoxy, and finding their remaining belief Unitarian, have never been brought to interest themselves on the subject, and are never acknowledged by us as those from whom a practical exhibition of the effects of our principles could be expected. On the contrary, among the orthodox sects, including those members of the Establishment who make any considerable pretensions to religion, a particular attention to all outward observances is essential to character : they consider abstinence from the gaieties of life as a direct requisition of duty, and the faults to which their situation most exposes them are hypocrisy and the vices which it may conveniently cloak. That they are not all free from these faults, is sufficiently notorious.

The Unitarian Christian does not in general feel himself under any obligation to such an observance of the Lord's-day as Dr. S. deems essential to a religious character, although not many, perhaps, may go so far the other way as Calvin or Mr. Belsham : but it certainly is not just to accuse men of irreligion because they wish to be influenced by their religion every day equally, when no precept applying the strict sabbatical law to Christians can possibly be produced, and its practical utility may, to say the least, be reasonably called in question.

It is not to be doubted, that among Unitarians the outward observances of religion are commonly regarded less as the performance of a direct duty, and more as means of improvement voluntarily resorted to, than amongst other sects. Those who think most of the absolute duty of paying a public homage to Almighty God, in the name of his chosen Messenger, will not, amongst us, pretend to determine how many times in one day this may be required ; and as on the question of expediency different opinions may be formed, those who think most seriously do not make the same point of attending worship several times on each Lord's-day with persons of a less degree of real religious feeling in other sects ; whilst indolence or carelessness more readily amongst us find excuses for the neglect of some valuable opportunities for improvement. We regret this result, because we are sure that all the services which are ever attempted by us, might be made useful and found interesting ; to some classes of society they are particularly important ; and that improvement of plan which would make them all that they might be, can hardly be expected, except under the sanction of a zealous and uniform attendance. We regret, then, much that our people, though

very many of them are exemplary, are not, speaking of them as a body, such regular frequenters of *all* the services of the house of God, (there are very few, we believe, who habitually or wantonly absent themselves from one service,) as the members of other sects; but we will not consent that what we both lament and blame should be considered as proving the absence of interest in religion, knowing, as we do, that many who will ordinarily attend but one service, will devoutly join in that one, and seriously endeavour to profit by it; knowing also that many will attend three or four services in a day, thinking that in so doing they are performing what is required or highly acceptable, and yet not seem much wiser or better for the whole. In short, we allow that Unitarians attach less importance to the ordinances and public exercises of religion, as *compared* with its feelings and its other duties, than their fellow-christians in general; that, in consequence, some may estimate their value at too low a rate, and indolence will more frequently tempt the less serious among them to a partial neglect of what ought, for our own good, and the good of our brethren, to be strictly observed by us all: but we deny that our body is chargeable with a general or habitual neglect of this kind of duties. There is a considerable proportion of it whose zeal for the public exercises of religion goes quite as far as is reasonable or useful; and we deny that the partial neglect (though an evil) by any means constantly implies indifference or impiety.

Dr. S. has shewn his want of any solid grounds for the accusations he has made, as well as the kind of spirit by which he was animated, in the most unfair use which he has made of a passage from an anonymous letter in the former series of this work. (Mon. Repos. December, 1817, p. 717.) The writer of that letter is evidently lamenting that persons belonging by *education* and *habit* to the *Establishment*, although brought to perceive the truth of our doctrines, as they are ready in conversation to avow, often cannot be induced so far to break through old habits and connexions as to join our worship, either continuing to frequent the church, or going nowhere. This Dr. S. represents as a testimony coming from ourselves to the neglect of religious ordinances amongst us. We give him credit for having mistaken, not wilfully falsified, the author's meaning; but with what views did he read, when he justified so serious a charge by evidence of such a character?

The following passage, being part of the additional matter with which our author has enriched his second edition, may, perhaps, be best noticed in this connexion; we feel it to be the more necessary to offer some remarks upon it, because the subject is one which has excited some uneasiness amongst ourselves, and Dr. S.'s information has probably been derived from papers inserted in a former volume of this work (Mon. Repos. Vol. XXI.):

"But I go farther, and make my appeal to intelligent and candid Unitarians themselves, whether they are not perfectly aware that a proportion, not inconsiderable or uninfluential, of their congregations, at the present time, throughout our country, consists of persons who do not disguise their scepticism or even settled disbelief with regard to the divine origin and paramount authority of the Christian religion? What has produced this coalition? Why does it continue, with every appearance of mutual contentment? Is not the undeniable cause a congeniality of spirit, and a conviction, on the part of those sceptics and infidels, that the theory of Unitarianism approaches so nearly to their own, that any remaining differences may be well accommodated to the satisfaction of each party?"

Exaggerated as we believe the statement here made to be, we acknowledge that it has a foundation in truth. We are aware that in some few

places Unitarian congregations contain a small number of persons either sceptical, or denying the divine origin and authority of Christianity: but before we feel any shame at this fact, or admit the justice of any unfavourable inferences from it, we must inquire, first, why such persons desire to join our societies; secondly, what is implied on our part in receiving them as fellow-worshippers; and, thirdly, what are the actual, or what will be the probable, effects of the union so far as it exists. Now, as to the first point, it is plain that no one will attend on Unitarian services from mere worldly motives, because the most open opposition to all religion is not more unpopular—is, indeed, by many even less severely condemned, than the testimony against its corruptions which is borne by Unitarians. Those who in rejecting revelation despise all religion, either frequent no place of worship, or go to the Established Church, from motives of interest or fashion. Those, on the contrary, who believe in the existence, perfections, and government of God, in the necessity of virtue to human happiness, and in a future retributory state—who consequently desire to pay public homage to God, and to listen to moral instructions and exhortations—if from any cause they find it not convenient to have services on their own principles, will, of course, wish to attend where they hear most of what they approve, and least of what they disapprove, and will thus be naturally led to Unitarian places of worship. They can have no motive for appearing there but what is creditable to themselves—the desire of shewing respect for practical religion, and in the purest form which circumstances admit of paying their social homage to the God of Nature and of Providence. If, as many do, though in our judgment inconsistently with the rejection of his divine authority, they regard the morality taught by Christ as most excellent, and his character as deserving of respect, they will hear in a Unitarian service nothing to disgust them, though a good deal which they cannot admit as true, and their coming can be taken only as a testimony of their desire to cultivate pious affections, and to promote their moral improvement. As no confession of faith is required, they are guilty of no insincerity, and cannot be accused of making any false professions—to which, indeed, no possible inducement is held out. What, then, let us next inquire, is implied on the part of Unitarian Christians in receiving as fellow-worshippers those who do not believe in the divine mission of him who is acknowledged as their Lord and Saviour? And here it is important to observe, that the English Presbyterian congregations, which form the great majority of those now entertaining Unitarian sentiments, in consequence at first of the impossibility of practically carrying into effect, in their circumstances, the mode of church government which they approved, and afterwards of a growing attachment to religious liberty, and jealousy of all interferences with it, have long been *entirely without any attempt at a church constitution or discipline*. A minister of the general religious sentiments of the majority of the people, and who is believed to possess suitable qualifications, is chosen, who, studying the Scriptures freely for himself, is to teach what he believes to be Gospel truth. All who desire to hear his instructions, constitute the congregation. There is no creed; no man is called in question by his brethren respecting his faith; the minister does not feel himself justified in going beyond friendly advice and such discussion as may seem to him likely to be useful. The ordinances of religion are closed against no one who satisfies his own conscience as to the propriety of his partaking in them, and no one is subjected to unpleasant proceedings if he think it right to absent himself from any of them; and thus, in fact, until new regulations are made for the purpose, it is not in the power of a con-

gregation of Unitarian Christians to prevent their being joined by any other persons who may desire to be numbered amongst them.

If congregations of Unitarian Christians were voluntary associations of persons deliberately making profession of certain common principles, and therefore, of course, excluding those who think differently, we know not that any one could question their right thus to constitute themselves, or, so long as there is no desire to inflict any injury on others thinking differently, could have any reasonable cause for complaint. In that case, though any one might come as a hearer, none could be a member of the society who could not make a solemn declaration of belief in the same sentiments. But what, let us now ask, should we gain as to the usefulness of our services by such a measure? We should discourage the conscientious Deist, or the yet hesitating Sceptic, from attending the only public services in which they can join with advantage, and which, we trust, have a tendency to correct what we regard as their very serious errors, as well as to encourage their juster sentiments and excite their better feelings; and we should do this from the selfish hope of standing some trifle higher in the estimation of those who, in the face of our most solemn declarations of our belief in the divine authority of our Saviour, and in the inestimable benefit of his mission, can still accuse us of congeniality of sentiment respecting the character and claims of the gospel with sceptics and infidels. Are we, then, ashamed because even those who cannot bring themselves to admit the revelation to which we gratefully ascribe all our light and all our hopes, yet acknowledge that our doctrines appear to them to be those of true and practical religion, and that they themselves are happier and better for listening to them? Are we grieved because *almost they are persuaded to be Christians*—because they allow the truth and goodness of our instructions, and the force of the additional arguments by which we recommend them, even whilst they call in question their having been communicated by divine authority? We must, indeed, think that those who reject Christianity, even if they make the most of Natural Religion, and much more than we can believe would ever have been made of it without the indirect aid of Revelation, are yet in an error, seriously pernicious to themselves, and fraught with dangerous consequences to others; and if, in consequence of the knowledge that some such persons came amongst us, we suppressed the expression of our own convictions, dwelling less earnestly on the claims of our Lord to our love and obedience, or on the blessed hopes which we found on his promises and resurrection, we might then justly be condemned; but so long as we are only rendered more anxious to establish the authority of our revered Master, more abundant in our labours to cause his name to be honoured, his commands respected, and his promises cherished, it would be difficult to say how our faith should be implicated in the homage which is paid to the purity and excellence of the system we teach, even by those who professedly do not join with us in attributing to it a divine original. It will be recollected that to such persons we make no concessions; we advance not one step to meet them. We rejoice that the Christianity which we derive from the Scriptures is not repulsive to the natural reason of man, in an age of accumulated knowledge and high intellectual culture; but we alter not one jot or one tittle of what we find in the Scriptures to satisfy either our own reason or that of others, because divine instruction is intended to supply the deficiencies of reason, and, if received at all, must be received as authoritative. We rejoice that any, who agree with us in any great principle, will come and worship along with us; and God forbid that we should

threaten them in consequence of the deficiencies of their faith, or pretend to identify the opinions, however erroneous in our judgment, which they have formed in a sincere desire to know the truth, with the corrupt and wicked opposition made to the Gospel by the unbelievers whom our Lord condemns.

We cannot wonder that those who, on grounds of Natural Religion exclusively, believe in essentially the same truths respecting the perfections, character, and government of God, the duties and expectations of man, which we rejoice in as revealed to us through Jesus Christ, should be better satisfied with our services than with those which are founded on doctrines believed by them to be absurd and pernicious; and we have no wish to close our doors against them. They are not of us; but they are willing to be with us—we hope they will not be the worse for joining with us. It remains to be inquired whether they do us any real injury. What are the effects of the union so far as it exists? We have shewn that it is not the result of any formal agreement between the parties, but simply the consequence of the constitution of our congregations. A place is set apart for Christian worship on Unitarian principles; there is no creed or test of any kind employed; no one claims a right to inquire into his neighbour's faith; the minister feels himself called upon to do all which circumstances will allow, publicly and privately to improve all his hearers in Christian knowledge and practice, but pretends to no authority to mark any with the sign of his approbation or censure; all may enter freely; and whoever thinks it right to contribute to the support of public worship becomes, by that act, a member of the congregation. Since, then, it is acknowledged that serious Deists must necessarily regard Unitarian Christians as teaching chiefly what is true and useful, and as much nearer to them in opinions than other Christians, it is plain why some such persons have joined Unitarian congregations; and it is evident that, though they are received in all kindness and friendship, there exists no formal or solid union between them and their fellow-worshippers; and that from their presence no conclusion can justly be drawn respecting the sentiments of any who profess themselves Unitarian Christians. By their presence we are certainly injured, inasmuch as it gives occasion for uncandid adversaries to misrepresent our opinions; but we trust that no consideration of this kind will ever induce us to change our conduct towards any of our fellow-creatures. Can they, then, cause the sentiments delivered in our pulpits to be less truly Christian sentiments? This is only possible either by their unfavourably influencing the choice of our ministers, or by their causing them, through fear of offence, not as much as they ought to support their instructions by Christian authority, or to dwell on those affections and hopes which peculiarly belong to the Gospel. With respect to the first of these means—it is a thing perfectly understood amongst all who frequent our worship, whatever may be their own particular views, that it is Christian worship to which they are giving their countenance: a very great majority in every congregation would be both dissatisfied and much shocked at the thought of any other. No open attempt could be made to substitute services founded on mere natural religion, without an immediate separation of those who approved from those who disapproved of the measure; that is, without the friends of the measure meeting avowedly as Deists, which they are at liberty to do, so far as we are concerned, whenever they judge it expedient. An attempt *artfully* to introduce, as a Christian minister, a person not really deserving of that name, would be inconsistent with that character and those views which alone can lead men to worship God at all, and is, therefore, not likely to be made; whilst it could hardly

fail to be detected, and consequently, if made, could only end in the disgrace of its authors. All who attend on the services of religion are equally interested in the minister who is to conduct them possessing such character, attainments, and address, as will give most weight to his instructions, most dignity and usefulness to his office. In the pursuit of these objects all may join, and theory combines with experience to prove that, in the case now under our consideration, no injurious consequences are to be apprehended. As to the other supposed means of injury—if ministers are capable of modifying their *doctrines* according to the supposed taste of any of their hearers, they may just as easily modify their *moral instructions* on the same principle, and the utility of their office is at an end. We think it is not without reason that better things are expected from them. We have great confidence in the effects of their peculiar studies and habits of thought, in ennobling, purifying, and strengthening the mind; we have great confidence in their knowledge, that, in a vast majority of cases, the honest and faithful performance of their duty is the way to secure the esteem and affection of the great body of their hearers, and there is abundant proof from experience that the confidence we express is justly placed. We conclude the whole subject with the observation, that it is notorious that Unitarianism has brought numbers to a joyful and grateful acknowledgement of revelation, who had been driven to reject it by the revolting character of more prevalent forms of Christianity, whilst very few pass from Unitarianism to Unbelief, and with those few it appears to be the result of peculiarities of individual character or circumstances, not of any natural current setting from the one doctrine towards the other. We are by no means sure that on this important subject we have expressed the general sentiments of the Unitarian body; though, believing that we have expressed the dictates of justice and charity, we would hope that our brethren do not widely differ from us. Many, no doubt, regard Unbelievers with a sort of horror—probably from an opinion that none become so but from wilful obstinacy and moral corruption. That these are the causes of a great deal of unbelief is unquestionable; but a sceptical turn of mind, unfavourable impressions made at the most critical period of life, and disgust at doctrines represented as essential, cause a good deal more; and those Unbelievers who shew any disposition to come amongst us, are generally persons possessing a real respect for religion, and desire to improve by its exercises. We do not, therefore, wish to see them condemned or rejected, and we have great doubt as to the advantage of the only measure which could secure a separation between us and them—the adoption of a profession of faith and a system of church-membership. We do not question the right to adopt this measure, and we do not venture to decide on its expediency, but we think we have abundantly shewn that there is nothing which either party need be ashamed of in the circumstance of our societies, open as they now are, having been in some places joined by individuals not professing to believe in revelation, nothing which throws the smallest imputation on the sincerity of our own faith, or gives the least cause for exultation to our adversaries.

Passing by much matter of a merely personal character, which, though in our opinion both unjust and illiberal, can hardly be thought to require the answer which it would occupy much space to give, we shall now offer a few remarks on Dr. Smith's "Observations on the Introduction to the *Calm Inquiry*."

Mr. Belsham very judiciously reminds his readers, that since "all Christians agree that Jesus of Nazareth was to outward appearance a man like

other men," and that his prophetic office, miracles, and resurrection, do not necessarily imply his superiority of nature, "it follows, that in this inquiry the whole burden of proof lies upon those who assert the pre-existence, the original dignity, and the divinity of Jesus Christ." The Unitarian finds nothing more in the Scriptures than what all acknowledge to be there—others imagine that much more is to be found—it is their business to bring forward their proofs: we establish our own doctrine, if we only shew those alleged proofs to be insufficient.

"In this controversy, therefore," continues Mr. B., "the proper province of the Arian and Trinitarian is to propose the evidence of their respective hypotheses; that is, to state those passages of Scripture which they conceive to be conclusive in favour of their doctrines. *The sole concern of the Unitarian is, to shew that these arguments are inconclusive.*"—(Calm Inquiry, p. 2.)

It would hardly seem possible to extract from these words any other meaning than that the Unitarian, himself fully convinced that his own is the doctrine of Scripture, will have done every thing required for convincing his opponents when he has shewn the inconclusiveness of the texts brought forward by them, since by general confession what remains, after the peculiar evidence for reputed orthodoxy is taken away, is Unitarianism. Yet upon this observation, perfectly just as a logical position, and, one might have thought, altogether inoffensive in its mode of expression, Dr. Smith has the following remarks:

"This might be proper, if controvertists had no love to truth, nor sense of its value; if they were theological prize-fighters, who cared for nothing but victory or the semblance of victory. But ill do such expressions comport with the mind and motives of a sincere and serious and 'calm inquirer' after an object so momentous as SACRED AND ETERNAL TRUTH. To obtain that object *ought* to be the *sole concern* of Unitarians, and of all other men; and it solemnly behoves those who are pleased with this consequential flippancy of assertion, to examine well the state of their own hearts before him who will not be mocked."

It is a strange misapprehension of Mr. B.'s meaning, which has given occasion to this vituperative language. We need not point out the dispositions to which the error may be traced.

Another very important caution of Mr. B., which has also excited Dr. Smith's wrath, is the following:

"Impartial and sincere inquirers after truth must be particularly upon their guard against what is called the natural signification of words and phrases. The connexion between words and ideas is perfectly arbitrary: so that the natural sense of any word to any person means nothing more than the sense in which he has been accustomed to understand it. But it is very possible that men who lived two thousand years ago might annex very different ideas to the same words and phrases; so that the sense which appears most foreign to us might be most natural to them."

"If," says Dr. S., "the Calm Inquirer means only to assert that the interpretation of a language must proceed on an enlightened acquaintance with its idioms, he has said no more than a school-boy knows and practises every day. But it is doing no service to the improvement of reason or the investigation of truth to represent the phrases 'natural signification,' and 'natural sense,' as if they were properly or usually applied to the bald and blundering methods of translation, which betray those who use them to be ignorant of the principles of language. I am greatly mistaken if the established use of those expressions, with correct speakers, is not to denote that sense of a word

or phrase which it would carry, at the time, and under all the circumstances, in the minds of the persons to whom it was originally addressed."

The author goes on to shew that the connexion between words and ideas depends on the laws of association, and that we are possessed of means by which a moral certainty may be attained as to the true meaning of words and phrases in ancient writings, all which is in perfect agreement with Mr. B.'s principles: indeed, it is acknowledged in a note "that the *Calm Inquirer* has, in another of his observations, recognized the principal rules of interpretation."

Mr. B. warns the impartial inquirer against "what is called the natural signification of words and phrases."

We read the Bible daily from childhood upwards, and it may be hoped that we do not read it without attaching some meaning to the words. The sense in which we first take its various parts must either be that which is suggested by parents and instructors, or that which occurs to ourselves at a time when neither our knowledge nor judgment is much to be relied upon. This sense is by frequent perusal strongly associated with the words and phrases, and immediately occurs to us as belonging to them whenever we consider them; it is *what is called* their *natural sense*, and is in general, to a great degree, the sense ascribed to them by those amongst whom we live: but if we are serious inquirers after divine truth, we shall examine and correct it by a faithful application of the just principles of interpretation, which will often shew us that the sense which seemed natural to us, has little pretensions to be accounted the true one. Now, there is nothing more common than to object to the best-founded and most valuable explanations of Scripture, that they are unnatural, that they give to the words a forced and unnatural sense, when nothing is really intended but that they are not familiar to us, and are opposed to our established associations. Dr. S. must, on reflection, be well aware that feelings of this kind are among the most formidable obstacles to the right understanding of Scripture, and he will hardly say that they do not furnish the most common answers to Unitarian expositions of Scripture: he certainly will not maintain that an answer founded on them is sufficient: let him then be ashamed of his angry declamation, and acknowledge that the *Calm Inquirer's* remark is neither "a mere truism," nor "a denial of all certainty in philological studies," but a useful practical caution of which most readers who are not critical scholars, and not a few who are, stand greatly in need.

Dr. S. is greatly scandalized at the expression, "the incarceration of the Creator of the world in the body of a helpless, pining infant," employed by Mr. B. in describing the orthodox doctrine. We do not wish to defend any thing which needlessly hurts the feelings of others, but as Dr. S. talks of *misrepresentation*, we must remind him that the language is justified by that seriously used by very orthodox writers. What is to be thought of the following language from Bacon?

"The Christian believes a Virgin to be the mother of a Son; *and that very Son of hers her Maker*. He believes him to have been *shut up in a narrow cell, whom heaven and earth could not contain*. He believes him to have been born in time, who was and is from eternity. He believes him to have *been a weak child and carried in arms, who is Almighty*; and him *once to have died, who alone has life and immortality*."

When such is the language of orthodox piety, the Unitarian may surely be excused some little strength of expression on the subject.

Dr. S. concludes his observations on Mr. B.'s introduction, and with them the first great division of his work, in these words :

“ It would have been no disparagement to the writer of the *Calm Inquiry*, had he urged the duty of cherishing impartiality, sincerity, and the love of truth, *by the means* of assiduous PRAYER to the Author of truth, a recollection of our amenableness to his tribunal, and a holy state of our mental feelings, in reference to his presence and perfections. Without these moral cautions, can it be expected that our inquiries will be really impartial or will terminate successfully? The principles of human nature and the righteousness of the Divine government equally forbid the expectation. Happy will those be who realize the devotion and faith of him who said, ‘ With THEE is the fountain of life ; in THY light we shall see light ! ’ But on such subjects the *Calm Inquiry* observes the silence of death.”

Mr. B. recommends impartiality, and the sincere, disinterested love of truth ; he does not enter on the means of attaining and cultivating these qualities, because those means are not unknown or much disputed : he was writing a controversial, not a practical work, and he meant to confine himself to one volume of moderate size, where he could not, like Dr. S., give 200 pages to introductory considerations. Nothing can be found in his book unfavourable to habits of devotion or feelings of piety. The impartiality which he recommends—the love of truth, without regard to external advantages, sensual pleasures, or the gratification of ambition and vanity—is itself a *holy state of the mental feelings*, and it is hard to reproach him with *the silence of death* when he speaks learnedly and ably on the subject he undertakes to discuss, because he does not digress into a practical treatise on devotion and faith. Sincere devotion, and prayer, its noblest exercise and best excitement, are most valuable means of producing the dispositions which aid us in the search for truth ; but it must be remembered, that there is a sort of prayer often employed in what is called religious inquiry, which is no more than a mustering of fears and prejudices against the admission of any new light, or an attempt to overpower the resistance of reason to popular opinions by an accumulation of distempered and enthusiastic feelings. There are many also who pray indeed for help from God in the understanding of his word, but, entertaining the unfounded expectation of that help being afforded in the form of immediate and supernatural assistance, instead of improving by their pious exercises in the humble and diligent application of the means of knowledge, are puffed up with a vain conceit of their infallibility, and led to ascribe to their own crudest conceptions the authority of divine communication. As these are faults into which those who agree with Dr. S. are peculiarly apt to fall, we have at least as good reason for wondering that he did not guard against such common and dangerous abuses of what he justly recommends, as he had for reproaching Mr. B. with his silence on a subject which his plan did not oblige him to introduce.

We have been able to notice but a few of the more important passages in that portion of Dr. Smith's work which has now engaged our attention. There is hardly a page in which something does not call for animadversion, and there are some subjects of very high interest, as the Unitarian views of the perfections of God, and the inspiration of the Scriptures, which demand distinct essays to do them any justice. We hope, however, that what we have done may be sufficient to make known the true character of what is represented as a formidable attack on our opinions, to expose the treatment which Mr. Belsham has received from one who would willingly be thought a candid adversary, and to repel some charges which, though glaringly

false, may be said to be admitted, because Unitarians have not thought it needful to give them a distinct denial—because, in short, no one has yet undertaken the labour of a reply, which must occupy at least three volumes, and when finished, might probably be neglected—by our friends, because they are already fully satisfied—by our opponents, because very few of them desire to know any thing of our side of the question.

ON DIVINE JUSTICE.

Θεός δε ου τιμωρεῖται· ἐστὶ γὰρ ἡ τιμωρία κακῆ ἀνταποδοσις—κολαζέει μὲντοι πρὸς τὸ χρησιμὸν καὶ κοινῇ καὶ ἰδίᾳ τῆς κολαζομένης.

IN p. 66 of Bishop Butler's Analogy, I find the following words: "Some men seem to think the sole character of the Author of Nature to be that of simple, absolute benevolence. And supposing this to be the only character of God, veracity and justice in him would be nothing but benevolence conducted by wisdom. Now, surely this ought not to be asserted unless it can be proved, for we should speak with cautious reverence upon such a subject." I quite agree with this able and excellent author that we ought to treat the question with cautious reverence. But upon the first view of the subject, it is manifest that not less temerity would be shewn by affirming that justice and veracity in God are independent of benevolence, than by affirming that they are included in it. And that they *are* included in it, several considerations may be brought forward to shew; while, for the contrary proposition, no probable argument can be advanced. I shall confine my remarks to the attribute of justice. If justice, then, in God be not a modification of benevolence, it is not analogous to that principle which we otherwise denominate justice, and it is in vain for us to reason concerning it. Justice in man, or that *to which alone we give the name of justice*, is evidently a branch of general benevolence, and even when it assumes its severest form, and is employed in awarding the punishment of guilt, it has a view to nothing but utility; and, however it may miss of its object from a defect of wisdom, the object itself is always what benevolence approves, or rather what benevolence suggests. If punishment were inflicted with any other view than that of doing good either to the offender or to others, we should no longer consider justice as the principle which ordained such infliction, but should refer it without hesitation to the wantonness of cruelty or the malignity of revenge. To say, then, that justice in God may be altogether distinct from benevolence, is only to say that justice in God may *not* be justice; and to affirm that it is distinct from benevolence, would be to affirm that there is no attribute in the Divine Nature to which the term justice can with propriety be applied.

But it will be said that there is something in moral evil which calls for suffering as its consequence, without any regard to utility, and that Divine Justice is the principle by which this suffering is inflicted. On the concluding remark of this proposition, I need scarcely observe, that it is a mere abuse of language to call that justice which is supposed to do what justice never does. But the proposition that there is a demerit in vice which calls for suffering, *even though the suffering should be in every sense useless*, pre-

sents a fair subject of inquiry. Do we then perceive any thing in vice, *considered in itself*, which makes it necessary that pain should follow it, *even though this pain should be useless both to the sufferer and to others*? It is in vain to reply, that, according to the constitution of nature, suffering is the consequence of vice, and therefore that to suppose the fact to be different from what it is, is to suppose an impossibility. That guilt and pain are connected by a law of nature, is admitted. But the present inquiry is, whether we see any reason, exclusive of utility, why they should be thus connected. And I conceive that we do not. For the sake of brevity I shall occasionally use the term *punishment* for suffering by which neither the sufferer himself nor others would be benefited. Will it, then, be said, that the *fitness of things* requires that punishment should follow guilt? To speak of the fitness of things, without stating to what that fitness relates, is only to employ words instead of ideas, and to use a *relative* term as though it had an *absolute* sense. And granting all that has been said respecting the fitness of things, the question may still be asked, do we *see* that the fitness of things demands what it is now supposed to require? Perhaps it may be alleged that the human mind *intuitively* perceives that guilt ought to be followed by punishment. For other minds I cannot answer, but *I* have not this intuitive perception. I can, indeed, perceive clearly enough that punishment which shall be productive of good may be inflicted from a principle of benevolence, but beyond this I perceive nothing. But vice or sin, considered as an offence against the perfect law of God, may justly be visited with what has been termed vindictive punishment. I answer, that the perfection of the divine law, when considered, as it ought to be, in connexion with the frailty of man, does not appear to supply a reason for the infliction of punishment which should *do no good*; and that the perfection of the Divine *character* forbids the supposition that such punishment will be inflicted. But the honour of the Divine government, it may perhaps be said, requires that guilt should be followed by punishment. When it shall be shewn that the honour of the Divine government consists in something distinct from the good of the creation, this proposition will deserve to be considered. In the mean time it is sufficient to ask, how the honour of any government can be sustained by punishments which should have no beneficial influence on the subjects of this government? But does not the ordinary language of mankind seem to be founded on the supposition that guilt deserves punishment for its own sake? Do we not say of an atrocious criminal, a brutal murderer for example, that he deserves to suffer something worse than death? In reply, I observe, first, that the indignation which we feel at certain crimes, though a useful principle in our constitution, may sometimes mislead our judgment; secondly, that the ideas of guilt and punishment are so closely associated in our minds that we are apt to overlook the link by which the things themselves are connected; thirdly, that were we to analyze our ideas when we use the above language, we should find our meaning to be, that while death is the legal punishment for lighter offences, the atrocious criminal, if punished according to the enormity of his crime, might justly experience a severer doom. But let us be convinced that *no good whatever* would follow this severer punishment, and we should immediately acknowledge that to inflict it would only be to add one evil to another.

But, it will be asked, does not every man *feel* that sin deserves punishment for its own sake, and independently of any benefit by which the punishment may be followed? To this question I would reply, that where

reason is silent, feeling is a dubious authority. And reason finds no connexion between guilt and punishment but what is founded upon individual or public advantage. As for the feeling in question, the case seems to be this. The ideas of guilt and punishment are associated in our minds by various means from our earliest years. Hence arises the notion of *demerit*, which, in consequence of this association, is familiar to every man; but perhaps not one man in a thousand has considered whence this notion is obtained, or what is implied in it. And all that a man, whether properly or improperly, can be said to *feel*, is a persuasion that the appointment by which punishment follows guilt is just and proper. But in what the justice and propriety of this appointment consist, reason must inform him if he is informed at all. And he who says that guilt merits punishment for its own sake, says a great deal more than his feelings have ever taught him. He has proceeded to argue upon what he feels, and has drawn a conclusion which I conceive to be erroneous. In a word, the only *intelligible* view of the connexion between vice and suffering is, that vice is a disease, and that suffering is intended to effect its cure or to check its contagion.

I think it sufficiently appears that punishment, as far as we are able to judge, has for its object *utility alone*; and I conceive that I cannot conclude better than by presenting to the English reader the meaning of my motto: "God does not inflict vindictive punishment, for this is the returning evil for evil; he chastises, however, for utility, both publicly and individually, those whom he chastises."

E. COGAN.

ASPLAND'S SERMON.*

A WIDE range for activity has ever been open to the professors of Unitarian Christianity (as to the professors of all truth) in the explanation of their opinions and the enforcement of the principles on which those opinions are founded. This range is widening every day. Though we are no longer hemmed in on every side by bigoted enmity, there is still enough of ignorance and prejudice around us to make it necessary, for the millionth time, to declare what our opinions are, and in self-defence to "intreat" because we are "defamed." This least agreeable duty is imposed upon us by the portion of society which calls itself the most religious. Next comes the delightful employment of developing to those who are with us in opinion the consequences of the principles to which they assent. There is much for us to do in displaying, in proportion as they are revealed to ourselves, the power, the beauty, and the perfect blessedness, which are the eternal attributes of truth. Lastly, it becomes our animating duty (and the privilege is conspicuously conferred on Unitarian Christians) to make known to philosophical unbelievers what Christianity is when divested of superstition, and to help those among them who are prepared—the serious and candid—to a sympathy with our hope, and a participation in our joy. If the choice of our duty were left to ourselves, all would probably prefer having to deal

* The Religious Belief of Unitarian Christians truly Stated, and Vindicated from Popular Misrepresentation. A Sermon, preached at the Opening of the New Unitarian Chapel, Wareham, Dorsetshire. By Robert Aspland. Hunter, 1830.

with the two last of the three classes we have referred to ; but the drudgery of our cause must be gone through as well as its more congenial employments ; and this, not by an inferior order of minds, the hewers of wood and the drawers of water, to whom the drudgery of other causes may be committed. In religion there is no aristocracy of mind, no superior order to whom it may be permitted to delight themselves with the refinements which are wrought out of the irksome labour of their inferiors. In religion, each must be to all a servant for Christ Jesus' sake : each must be a labourer to clear away the rubbish from the foundations, as well as the architect who is to erect the pile, or the philosopher who is to gaze into heaven from its pinnacle when all is done. Delightful as may be the expansion of views and the lofty speculations into which we may enter with teachable or congenial minds, animating as may be the strenuous intellectual exercise which we share with really philosophical unbelievers, these occupations must alternate with the less hopeful ones to which we are compelled by Christian adversaries. Let there be no repining at this, since Paul had to remonstrate with corrupters of his own doctrine as well as to confirm his converts and to dispute with Athenians ; and Christ himself answered the cavils of the Pharisees in the morning, before he communed with his friends at Bethany in the evening, and reasoned with Nicodemus by night.

In proportion to the eminence of the advocate is the service rendered to the cause. Never, therefore, can the chief men among us feel themselves privileged to decline the labour which, though apparently "never ending, still beginning," carries with it a promise of recompense in the gradual spread of the truth, as well as in the gratitude of those who already hold it. It is many years since Mr. Aspland began to state the religious opinions of Unitarians. He has since been perpetually advocating and illustrating them ; but he must still go back and state them again. They are still new ; they still rouse attention and cause wonder. As, however, this is a proof that new hearers are present to listen, as there is a hope that to these new hearers the truth will become familiar as it has already become to those who were new hearers at the beginning of his career, we are sure there is no danger of his growing weary of the service which the cause still requires of him, and on which awaits the gratitude of all to whom that cause is dear.

The sermon before us divides itself into three portions. The first consists of a reprobation of bigotry, and of suggestions of encouragement to those who suffer under it. The second exhibits the religious opinions in which all Unitarians are agreed, and those less important ones on which some difference of opinion exists. The third contains a summary of the accusations most current against Unitarians. We give extracts from the first and third. It would be an injustice to the intermediate portion to separate any part of it from its connexion.

"Whatever be the cause, the fact will, I take for granted, be admitted, that Unitarian Christians have been for ages, as they are now, *a sect every where spoken against*, and that the rancour with which we are 'spoken against' exceeds the common measure (large as that unhappily is!) of theological hostility. The more eager and zealous religionists of the day, in speaking of us, find no terms too gross, no censures too harsh and severe. Our arguments are fairly open to discussion, to objection, and (if it be thought fitting) to reprobation ; but these are rarely laid hold of except to be misstated and distorted and falsely coloured ; they are commonly abandoned for easier and more inflammatory methods of arousing the blind superstition and angry prejudice of the multitude. Ridiculous stories are propagated concerning us and find ready credit with listeners whose ears have been previously

poisoned; speeches are attributed to us which we never made, or, consistently with our habits and opinions, could possibly make; and in not a few cases the pious fraud is resorted to, of inventing tales of divine and miraculous judgments upon us, in order to delude the credulous and awe the simple. The combined result of all this machinery of artifice and falsehood is, that many persons are utterly surprised when upon examination they find, or by accident learn, that we are not scoffers and blasphemers, that we pray to Almighty God, that we receive the Holy Scriptures with reverence and study them as a Christian duty, and that we believe in the Lord Jesus Christ, as a divinely-commissioned Teacher and an all-sufficient Saviour.

"*Being defamed we intreat.* We make no apology, indeed, for our faith; we owe none to man. We have derived it from the word of God, and we are not ashamed of it, nor can we honestly hide it or dress it out in any disguise. Much as the statement may surprise many that do not scruple to declare themselves our enemies, we trust that *we have the mind of Christ*. We know that we have searched diligently and sometimes painfully for it, and our belief has at least these two marks of truth, 1st, that we can express it in the very words of our Lord and his apostles, and, 2ndly, that it produces in us, as we hope, (and we always pray that it may produce in us more completely and effectually,) the moral spirit of the holy and merciful Jesus,—a spirit that leads us neither to value ourselves nor to decry others, on account of mere opinions, that teaches us to exalt above all creeds the higher matters of justice, mercy, and the fear of God, and that disposes us to make allowance for human infirmity, to confess our own fallibility, to acknowledge the real virtues of our fellow-christians of whatever persuasion, to instruct in meekness them that oppose us, and to forgive them that revile and spitefully use us. *Being defamed, we thus, like the apostle, intreat.* We say to our accusers, 'Listen to us and judge of our doctrine by the Holy Scriptures to which we all appeal. Estimate our faith, not by public report, which is often erroneous and sometimes malicious, but by our arguments. Take not your opinion of us from our adversaries who caricature us, instead of drawing our true likeness. Understand before you condemn; hear before you strike. We intreat you not to wrong your own souls by prejudice; for all prejudice is hurtful, and no man can injure another by a precipitate judgment, without doing at least equal harm to his own mind and temper and character. If we be in error, it is by cool and patient investigation alone that you can discover the error, and separate it from any truth with which it may be mixed up:—if we hold the truth,—and in the presence of Almighty God, and on the faith of the Bible, and as we value our own souls, we here publicly and solemnly declare that we believe we do hold the truth,—your passionate hostility will prevent you from perceiving and acknowledging it, and will bind you down in captivity to *another gospel, which yet is not the gospel*. For the sake of Christianity, for the sake of humanity, for your own sake as well as ours, we *intreat* you to lay aside prejudice and enmity, and to hearken to our statements with a candid ear, and to weigh them in the balances of the sanctuary.'"
—Pp. 8—10.

"While we complain of the accusations brought against Unitarians, it would be unreasonable not to allow that some of them are harmless by being inconsistent. At one moment they are likened to the Pharisees, at another to the Sadducees, who were a perfect contrast; sometimes they are described as of lax morality, at others their good works are admitted in order to introduce the charge of their relying upon them for salvation; now, they are exclaimed against for making God all mercy, and presently they are pitied—pitied, not without scorn and condemnation—for having no hope of mercy hereafter.

"In respect of moral character, let me say that unworthy individuals there are in all communions, and ours cannot be expected to be alone free from this reproach. Of immorality as a sect, no one, I apprehend, would be bold enough to accuse us, although it is said by some of the more precise profes-

sors of religion, that we possess the spirit of the world. The spirit of the world! were this ours, my fellow-christians, what should hinder us from adopting the world's faith and the world's worship? Why have you separated with so many personal sacrifices from your former religious connexions, and raised this edifice for the quiet performance of rites agreeable to your consciences? Why have you called your Christian brethren to witness this morning your sanctification of this House of Prayer to the honour of the incommunicable name of Jehovah? And why have I stood up at your invitation, to vindicate our body from imputations cast upon us only because we will not yield religious conformity to this world and this world's teachers and rulers? We are in fact reproached with a worldly spirit by some of our fellow-dissenters, simply because we refuse to carry dissent further than conscience constrains us, judging that it is not only lawful, but a part of social duty, to be in a state of unity with our fellow-countrymen in things that are morally indifferent. When we are thus condemned we are judged by a law which we do not acknowledge; and the sentence which is pronounced against us, because we are comparatively few in number, really involves the greater part of the Christian world. With them and for them, as well as ourselves, we protest against a standard of virtue which is not sanctioned by Christianity, but is on the contrary at variance with our Lord's example and precepts. We renounce the morality which consists in looks and apparel and much-speaking; in resistance to the harmless usages of civilized life and refined society; and in putting down innocent cheerfulness, and setting up affected gloominess and severity: we adhere to the old morality and religion of the Sermon on the Mount, standing in justice, mercy, and the fear of God; and should we, for this preference of our Lord to earthly masters, be followed with the inconsistent denunciation of being worldly-minded, whilst in reality no place is left for us in the believing or the unbelieving world, we must take refuge in the judgment of the great Head of the Church, 'If ye were of the world, the world would love its own.'—Pp. 21, 22.

The Preface informs us that the publication of this discourse has been requested, not only by the congregation assembled at Wareham, but by several other bodies of Unitarians before whom its substance has been delivered. We hope this affords an assurance of its wide circulation and consequent important usefulness. If so clear and explicit a statement of our opinions as this could extensively fix the attention of our Christian adversaries, the days would be in prospect when the remonstrances which we are now obliged to connect with our statements would be needless, because the worst charges against us would have become obsolete.

A PARABLE.

As the sun was withdrawing his light from one hemisphere, the guardian spirits of man followed his course, as they were wont, that they might visit every land in turn.

But two who had been busy among the abodes of men all the day, lingered, unwilling to leave those to whom they had ministered.

To the one had been committed the urn which held the waters of bitterness, and he was called WOE. His young sister was named PEACE; and in her hand was placed the lyre whose music was of heaven.

"There are some," said WOE, "who will not be ready to hearken to thee to-morrow, my sister, if I leave them already."

"There are also some, my brother, whom I have not yet soothed to deep repose. O! that we might tarry awhile!"

"We may not tarry, for there is need of us afar. Yet one thing may we do. Let us give of our power to another, that she may minister till we return."

So they called upon CONSCIENCE, and charged her to descend with the shadows of night, and to visit the abodes of men. The angel of WOE gave her of the waters of his urn, and said unto his sister "Give her thy lyre, for what other music needest thou than thine own songs? What other melody is so sweet?"

And when they had charged their messenger to await them at the eastern gate when the morning should open it unto them, they spread their wings and hastened down the west.

Their messenger gazed after them afar: and when she marked the dim majesty of the elder spirit, and the mild beauty of his sister, she bent her head and silently went her way.

"What hast thou beheld?" said the angels to their messenger, when the portals of light were unclosed. "Are the healing waters spent? Hath the lyre been tuneful?"

"The waters are not spent," she replied; "for mine own tears have made this urn to overflow. The lyre was tuned in Paradise; else my trembling hand had jarred its strings."

"Alas!" cried the younger spirit, "where then hast thou ministered?"

"When the evening star appeared, I descended among the shadows, where I heard a voice calling to me from afar. It came from a space where raging fires were kindled by the hands of priests. Night hovered above, but the flames forbade her approach, and I could not abide longer beneath her wings. He who appealed unto me stood chained amidst the fires which already preyed upon him. I swept the strings of the lyre, and smiles overspread his face. Even while the melody waxed sweeter, the dark-eyed spirit of the tombs came and bore him away asleep."

The young angel smiled as she said, "He hearkeneth now to nobler harmonies than ours! But was there none other amidst the flames to whom thou couldst minister?"

"Alas! there was one who lied through fear. He was led back to his cell, whither I followed him. I shed the waters into his soul, and the bitterness thereof tormented him more than any scorching flames which could have consumed his body. Yet must I visit him nightly till he dies."

"Droop not thy wings because of his anguish, my sister," said the elder spirit. "He shall yet be thine when he is made pure for thy presence."

"I have been," said the messenger, "beside the couch of the dying, in the palace, and beneath the lowly roof. I have shed into one departing soul the burning tears of the slave, and soothed the spirit of another with the voices of grateful hearts. I have made the chamber of one rich man echo with the cries of the oppressed, and have surrounded the pillow of another with the fatherless who called him parent. Kings have sought to hide themselves as I drew nigh, while the eye of the mourner hath lighted up at my approach. The slumbers of some have I hallowed with music, while they knew not I was at hand; and others have I startled with visions, who guessed not whence they came. I am filled with awe at mine own power."

"It shall increase," said the elder spirit, "while mine own waneth."

The fountain of bitter waters wasteth continually. When it shall be dried up, I will break mine urn."

"And my lyre," said his sister; "shall it not be hushed by mightier music from on high?"

"Nay, my sister, not then, nor ever. No mightier music shall make men cease to love thine. They shall gather together to hear thee in their cities, and shall seek thee in wildernesses and by the sea-shore. The aged shall hear thee chaunt among the tombs, and the young shall dance unto thy lay. Unto the simple shall thy melodies breathe from amidst the flowers of the meadows; and the wise shall they entrance as they go to and fro among the stars."

Then the messenger sighed, saying,

"When shall these things be?"

"When thou art queen among men. Knowest thou not that such is thy destiny? Thou art now our messenger, but we shall at length be thy servants. Yea, when yonder sun shall wander away into the depths, and the earth shall melt like the morning cloud, it shall be thine to lead the myriads of thy people to the threshold whence the armies of heaven come forth. It shall be thine to open to them the portals which I may not pass."

CONFESSIONS OF A MEMBER OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.*

IN the perusal of this work we have received no ordinary gratification. Whatever conclusion the writer had come to respecting the doctrine which he has subjected to examination, that of the Trinity, we could not have been otherwise than pleased at the spirit in which the book is written. Throughout there prevails an attachment to truth, a deep interest in divine things, a deference to the authority of Scripture, and a rejection of every other test of revealed doctrine; a patience of inquiry, a candour of judgment, and a sense of responsibility, which bespeak the piety of the writer, secure the favourable regards of the reader, and point the work out as a model of controversial writing. But, believing as we do, that of all the corruptions of Christianity, the doctrine of the Trinity is, with the exception of Transubstantiation, the greatest, we feel our gratification enhanced that the long and serious and disinterested inquiries of Mr. Shaw have led him to renounce Athanasius, and to cleave to Jesus Christ.

There are passages in the book in which, as we think, error is mingled with truth. On some occasions we like the conclusion better than the premises whence Mr. Shaw deduces it. But these and other things we pass over, at least at present. The only object we have now in view is, to lay before the reader the process through which the confessor's mind has gone, and the state in which it now is.

"I am a member of the Church of England—because, take it for all in all, I believe it to be the best church of the present day. I am, however, of William Law's opinion, that the purest church now existing is only the vestige of a

* The Confessions of a Member of the Church of England, occasioned by a Laborious Examination of the celebrated Work of the late Rev. W. Jones, entitled, "The Catholic Doctrine of a Trinity," and also an Essay on Socinianism. London, Marsh and Miller.

better thing. Still, it is natural to a person of a serious turn of mind to wish that he might rightly understand and entirely believe every important article of doctrine professed by the church of which he is a member: it was decidedly the case with me. I had been in the habit of reading the Holy Scriptures the greater part of my life, and I seldom opened the book without meeting some passages which appeared to me to be directly opposed to the doctrine of the Trinity, in the way in which that doctrine is set forth in the Athanasian and Nicene Creeds. This was a cause of grief to me for many years. *I eagerly read every book I could meet with written in defence of these creeds, and most scrupulously shunned the writings of those who controverted them.* In the course of my researches I sometimes met with arguments managed with such address and ability as made a strong impression on my mind in favour of the doctrine; but *on my return to the Bible these impressions were instantly effaced. For one text or expression from which the doctrine could in any possible way be inferred, I met with ten which, in my humble judgment, pointedly and unequivocally denied it.* I was at length informed that the Rev. Mr. Jones, of Nayland, had published a work which set the matter at rest; that he had incontrovertibly proved the doctrine to be scriptural. I immediately procured his 'Catholic Doctrine of a Trinity,' and read it with attention. It did not appear to me to be by any means satisfactory: I could not but suspect that he dealt unfairly with the Holy Scriptures. I resolved to take the first convenient opportunity of setting about a minute examination of every text he had quoted, and every argument he had advanced. I foresaw that this would be a laborious task, requiring much time, and as far as possible an abstraction from every other pursuit. Many years passed over before I found a fit opportunity for the undertaking: it was not till the winter of 1825, when confined by ill-health, that I commenced my task. I considered the matter to be of so much importance to my own peace of mind, that for more than two years it was principally, I may almost say exclusively, the subject of my meditations, and the object of my inquiry. I made the Scriptures my guide, and wholly unassisted (*excepting only by the comments of writers deemed orthodox*) I laboured through the work. No one can hesitate to give Mr. Jones the credit of sincerity and good intentions; yet I cannot but think he has injured rather than supported his cause. This appeared to me so obviously the case, that when I had gone through his work I doubted if it were proper to give my Confessions in the form of a review of it; for it might be said that the doctrine must not be condemned because it had been injudiciously stated and weakly defended by Mr. Jones. But on further consideration, as the book has strangely obtained a considerable degree of celebrity, and, moreover, as it afforded me the opportunity of bringing forward a powerful body of scriptural evidence, I thought it might as well remain in that form. That the sentiments of an individual, who has no pretensions to the character of a man of learning, will be considered only contemptible by writers esteemed orthodox, may be fully expected at the present time; yet *I confidently predict that before half a century passes over, the doctrine stated in these pages will be generally, if not unanimously, confessed throughout the kingdom.* It may fairly be asked, upon what grounds I hazard so bold a prediction? In the first place, a surprising expansion of the human intellect within the last thirty years (especially in our own country) has been noticed by every discerning person. Men are beginning to emancipate their minds from the trammels imposed upon them by *great names*, and are disposed to compare authorities, and to judge for themselves. Secondly, though we have frequent proof of great depravity and impiety among the very ignorant classes, Christianity is more seriously and more generally inquired into by the better informed part than it has hitherto been; we may, therefore, hope for a rapid progress in true Christian knowledge. Thirdly, the Greek language is now more generally studied than it had been in former times. This is very important; for it has been admitted by many orthodox divines, that our present translation of the New Testament (though probably the best extant) is incor-

rect in several places, and not a few of the inaccuracies will be found to affect the awful subject I have ventured to discuss. Lastly, I feel perfectly satisfied that the doctrine here stated is that which was taught by our blessed Lord and his apostles."

Mr. Shaw then proceeds to examine the passages adduced by Mr. Jones in proof of the Deity of Christ. In the course of his remarks, he very properly reprobates as mischievous the practice (which Mr. Jones and some other writers constantly adopt) of bringing detached sentences from distant parts of the Scripture and joining them together: the most absurd doctrines may appear to be proved by it; and the Bible is brought into contempt by frequently making it seem to contradict itself. Of this mode of imagined proof, the following, amongst others, is one on which Mr. Shaw animadvert.

Isaiah liii. 11, compared with 2 Pet. iii. 18: "I, even I, am the Lord, and besides me there is no Saviour." "Our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ."

The words Lord and Saviour occur in both of these texts. In the first, they are applied to the Father, and in the second, to the Son, and therefore Mr. Jones conceives that the doctrine of co-equality is established. "Jesus Christ is a Saviour, therefore he is Jehovah the Lord: Jesus Christ is Jehovah, therefore he is the Saviour." On this Mr. Shaw observes,

"If we follow Mr. Jones's system, we shall need to be extremely circumspect in our mode of expression. No orthodox writer would deny that Jehovah is the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. Yet if we say Jehovah is Christ, and Christ is Jehovah, it is orthodox; but if we say the Father is the Son, and the Son is the Father, which is in truth the very same, it is heresy and nonsense.

"The two texts quoted by Mr. Jones are easily understood, if we read them in simplicity; but his notions make the Bible unintelligible. The Almighty Father is declared to be the Creator of the world, yet it is said that the world was made by Christ. Again, the Father hath said, 'Thou shalt know that I, the Lord, am thy Saviour and thy Redeemer.' Yet of Christ it is said, that 'he is the Saviour of the world,' and that he hath 'redeemed us to God by his blood.' Both originated in the power and love of God, and were accomplished through the ministration of his ever-blessed Son.

"It is distressing to find a man of Mr. Jones's learning and piety closing his comments upon these two texts with a garbled and misapplied quotation from Phil. ii. 9. The text, if he had quoted fairly, would have been decidedly against him, for it runs thus:—'Wherefore God also hath highly exalted him, and given him a name, which is above every name.' The Apostle concludes with these words, 'That every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father.' How either co-equality or underived power can be proved from this passage is to me inconceivable."

Most frequent are the complaints which Mr. Shaw has to make of the manner in which Mr. Jones wrests the Scriptures to his purpose.

"The manner in which Mr. Jones uses the Holy Scriptures, makes it a distressing task to follow him through his arguments."—"He continually perplexes himself and his readers with incomplete or unfair quotations."

The following contains an important truth:

"We seldom meet with a text in the Bible which seems to give any countenance to this doctrine of the co-equality of our Lord with the Almighty Father, but is preceded or immediately followed by a plain denial of it."

We had thought the day for talking about the blood of God was passed. It seems not.

"The manner in which this doctrine of the co-equality or identity (for it often amounts to the latter) of the Father and the Son is frequently stated, cannot but be greatly injurious to Christianity. Mr. Jones, in the conclusion of his work, speaking of our Lord, says, 'Though he suffered, died, and was pierced upon the cross, and redeemed us by his blood, yet that blood was the blood of God, and upon his cross *Jehovah* was pierced.' Can it be a matter of wonder that we have Deists among us?"

At the conclusion of his examination, Mr. Shaw remarks,

"I have now gone through the first head of Mr. Jones's work, and truly I have found it a distressing task; for the manner in which he has made use of the Holy Scriptures, and the method of his reasoning, compelled me to meet him with arguments which seemed as if I were labouring to lower the dignity of our blessed Lord. Far be it from my heart to conceive a thought derogatory to the character of that ever-blessed Being, through whose infinite merits, sufferings, and intercession, I entirely look with humble hope for the forgiveness of my sins, and for acceptance at the awful day of account. Yet I dare not confess my assent to the doctrine which pronounces the *equality* of the Son with the Almighty Father, because our Lord himself, as well as his Apostles, have repeatedly, and in the most clear and express terms, taught a different doctrine."

In reference to the third person in the Trinity, Mr. Shaw observes,

"I searched the Scriptures many years for a proof of this (the Spirit's) personality, and that, too, with an earnest desire to discover it; but without success. My researches, though aided by orthodox commentators, have led me to believe that the notion is erroneous."

On the baptismal form in Matt. xxviii. 19, Mr. Shaw says,

"This is certainly the strongest, I believe I may say the only genuine, text that can be fairly advanced in defence of the doctrine of a Trinity of persons. If our Lord had added the words, 'Three persons and one God,' as does our Church, I should bow with perfect submission, though in opposition to so many other texts. Long, very long, did this passage dwell with me, though I continually met with passages in the Bible which seemed to be directly opposed to the use that is made of it. What can a poor, frail mortal, conscious of his lack of wisdom, do, but carefully to examine the word of God, to compare one part with another, to meditate deeply upon it with an earnest desire to arrive at the truth, and to implore the Father of lights to guide him by his Holy Spirit in the inquiry? This method I have endeavoured for many years most anxiously and devoutly to pursue: the result has been a clear conviction, that the words in the text were not intended to be an initiation into the doctrine of a Trinity of persons in the Godhead."

Mr. Shaw is not led to reject the doctrine of the Trinity from the teachings of his reason, but because it wants, to his mind, scriptural evidence.

"I again declare, that if the Athanasian doctrine were clearly set forth in any part of the Holy Scriptures, I would not allow my reason to have any influence over my faith; I would receive it as a truth, which it would be presumptuous to investigate too curiously with the limited powers of the human intellect; but I conceive I have shewn that it is denied in those Scriptures, and therefore I dare not confess it upon human authority."

The change of which Mr. Shaw spoke in the commencement of his Con-

fessions, from a corrupt to a pure form of Christianity, seems to be making progress even in the Church.

“ I am satisfied that *an immense majority* of the laity, especially of the educated part, and I have reason to believe not a few even of the clergy, most heartily regret the admission of any other creed into the Liturgy of our Church than that called the Apostles’—the great antiquity of which is universally acknowledged.”

Again,

“ From many conversations which have occasionally passed in my hearing, I am persuaded that *nine in ten* of the educated part of the laity look upon the Athanasian Creed just as men of education in the Romish religion do upon Transubstantiation—that is, as a gross absurdity. The clergy are not aware how widely this kind of scepticism prevails at the present day. The truth is, that this Athanasian Creed is a *canker-worm, gnawing the vitals of Christianity.*”

What a relief of mind must Mr. Shaw have felt in becoming a believer in the scriptural doctrine of one God the Father !

“ I would ask any candid man this simple question, Supposing that he had never heard of this doctrine (the Trinity), could he have discovered it in the Bible? For myself I can confidently say, that I might have devoted my whole life to the study of that blessed book without ever making the discovery. I know not how the minds of other persons may be affected in their religious exercises; but, speaking from my own experience, I declare, that during several years while I endeavoured to bring my mind into assent with the doctrine confessed in the Athanasian Creed, I felt *an inexpressible unhappiness and distraction.* All the ingenious arguments I heard or read failed of affording me complete satisfaction, especially when I turned to the Bible. *But now, when I endeavour to raise my soul to the Father of mercies through the mediation of his beloved Son, I feel a comfort and ease of conscience that were strangers to me in the former case.*”

Though fully convinced of the unscripturalness of the Trinity, the writer has not closed his mind to fresh evidence.

“ Having now delivered my sentiments, I avow myself open to conviction, if it can be shewn from the Holy Scriptures that I have erred; but I enter my protest against any other kind of authority.”

He thus terminates his strictures on the Trinity :

“ I now conclude by quoting a passage from the sermon of that pious prelate, Bishop Taylor—‘He who goes about to speak of the mystery of the Trinity, and does it by words and names of man’s invention; talking of essences and existences, hypostases and personalities, priority in co-equalities, and unity in pluralities, may amuse himself, and build a tabernacle in his head, and talk something, he knows not what: but the good man who feels the power of the Father, and to whom the Son is become wisdom, sanctification, and redemption, in whose heart the love of the spirit of God is shed abroad; this man, though he understands nothing of what is unintelligible, yet he alone truly understands the Christian doctrine of the Trinity.’ Is it possible for the pen or tongue of man to express a more severe censure upon the Athanasian Creed? To Bishop Taylor’s Trinity I would subscribe with all my heart; but I do not scruple to affirm, that the kind of Trinity described in this men-mocking creed is altogether unsupported by the Holy Scriptures.”

To the Confessions is appended an Essay on Socinianism. On this we shall content ourselves by remarking, that Mr. Shaw has written without a

sufficient knowledge of his subject. All Unitarians do not deny, as he affirms, the pre-existence of Christ, and none deny, as he affirms of all, "the offered 'propitiation through faith in his blood.'" Disagreeing as we do from many of his remarks on what he terms Socinianism, and disagreeing because we know more of what Unitarians really believe than Mr. Shaw, we are glad to be able to express our warmest approbation of the concluding sentences in his "Essay."

"I have allowed myself to run into this digression (on 'Socinianism') from my main object, in the hope of shewing the danger of yielding up our understandings in matters of religion to the direction of any man, however eminent he may be accounted for skill in particular branches of human science, unless his opinions be supported by the Holy Scriptures. Philosophy, under the guidance of a sound and unprejudiced mind, tends to a conviction of the truth of our holy religion; yet men, who devote their time and attention chiefly to experiments upon *matter*, frequently go astray when they treat of *spiritual* affairs. It cannot be denied that Dr. Priestley was an acute and laborious philosopher; but that philosophers are not always good theologians is obvious from the glaring contradictions of each other which we continually meet with in their writings.* Mr. Jones, of Nayland, was also an able philosopher; yet no two men were ever more directly opposed to each other in their religious opinions than he and Dr. Priestley. Let us then not say, 'I am of Jones,' and 'I am of Priestley.' Let us seek instruction at the fountain head—the Holy Scriptures: let us say with Peter, 'Lord, to whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life.'"

LETTERS FROM GERMANY.

No. V.

SIR,

Heidelberg.

MENDELSSOHN'S treatise on the Immateriality of the Soul of Man was first published at Vienna, in 1785. The Editor then informed the public, that they were indebted to his Prussian Majesty for the production of the essay, and that a condescending discretion on the part of the author had hitherto withheld it from publication. Perhaps the great Frederick constituted himself partner, and wished to have the lion's share. A Latin translation of the tract had appeared before, and the translator having been informed by a friend, that it was not disapproved by the author, he ventured to publish the German original. I do not know if it has ever appeared in English. If it has not, you may be willing to give a place to some extracts from it in your Repository. Many of the acutest reasoners of the last century were Spiritualists: some of the nineteenth century are so too: could they do it a greater service,—and in Republican France, (for it is and must be substantially that,) could they do their country a greater service,—than by promoting an alliance between liberalism and spiritualism?

The treatise is not long. It consists of answers to three questions, and some added remarks on *D'Alembert's* Thoughts upon the Spirituality of the Soul.

Quest. 1. Can matter have in itself the power to think?

Q. 2. If matter in its proper nature is incapable of thinking, cannot the Almighty communicate to it this property?

Q. 3. Must not the soul perish with the body? It grows up with the body, suffers with it, shares all its changes, and in age becomes feebler as the body gradually decays. A hard blow upon the head can reduce the greatest genius into idiocy: must not the power to think cease when the body is no more?

“*Quest. 1. Can matter have in itself the power to think?*”

“I believe that this has been demonstrated to be impossible; and that the objections against the arguments, which have been offered, reach the terms only in which they are expressed, which cannot be chosen so as to exclude every objection, because language itself is not flexible enough for the subtilty of the inquiry. Among other methods of proof, the following has appeared to me very convincing. It will be granted, that the objects in nature, or the things which are external to the thinking power, have each its own proper subsistence. Their conjunction depends upon mutual relations and proportions, which are not found in the objects alone, but in order to exist must first be thought of. For example, a house taken solely as an object, is not different from a pile of stones: but when the thinking power comes in, compares the parts, and perceives their relation to a whole, the pile is then irregular; but symmetry and order are observed in the building. In what do a well-ordered state and a promiscuous multitude differ from one another? Only in the proportion of the parts, and their relation to a whole; and these are not found in the citizens, as they exist objectively and severally, but in the comparison of each with all the rest. Father and son, stem and fruit, are in themselves isolated existences; but considered in their relation as cause and effect, they are conjoined.

“Suppose an object to be impressed on a certain part of a thinking material system; the impression as well as the external object must exist individually. Let A, B, C, D, be external objects, and a, b, c, d, parts of the percipient matter. Then will the percipient particle (a) have, as its immediate object, the impression upon it of the external object (A) which it represents; and all the other sentient atoms the same. But where will the proportion or relation of the objects be perceived? Not in any one of the percipient particles; for each notices only its own object, and things are seen to be related only by comparison: neither is it perceived in all the particles taken together, for the being taken together presupposes the perception of proportion or relation between them, without which each atom remains for ever individual, and never, in conjunction with the rest, composes a whole. In order to perceive relation, which supposes comparison, besides the thinking particles a, b, c, d, we must have a central particle (e), to which this office belongs. This particle must retain the impressions of all the objects A, B, C, D, that it may be able to compare them with one another. Since the central particle (e) is composed of parts, either the impressions must be again dispersed, or each of the parts which compose it must receive them all. In the first case, to compare them with one another is impossible; and in the latter case, we must come at last to what is indivisible, an atom, uniting the impressions of all the objects, and capable also of comparing them with one another, and perceiving their mutual relation. This indivisible, simple existence, which receives all the impressions, and is able to discern, combine, compare them, is essentially different from matter, which is, in its nature, divisible and aggregational. We distinguish it by the name of soul. I may leave to my opponent the choice, whether he will have the material substance consisting of such percipient atoms or indivisible particles; or will admit but one single, indivisible thinking substance, which receives and compares the impressions of all objects. In both cases it is not matter, or what is aggregated, which thinks, but what is simple and indivisible; only that in the first case, instead of making the soul to be a corporeal being, with the Materialist, he changes the body itself into an aggregate of souls. In a word, to perception or thinking it is necessary that what is multifold as an object, should

become one, or a unity, in the thinking subject; but matter is not, and cannot be, an absolute unity, because it consists of divisible parts, of which each one has its own individual subsistence "

I suppose that chemists of the present century will not admit our author's proof of the negative to be complete. Since, according to the latest chemical doctrine, there are ultimate particles of matter which are indivisible, that is, there are atoms; and since the reasoning of our philosopher has not proved it impossible that the soul of man should be one of them, it seems to fall short of a demonstration, that it is impossible the soul should be material. His reasoning in this place only proves the soul to be one and indivisible, and that it cannot be an aggregate or a system of parts. That gravity and the power to think co-existing in the same substance involves a contradiction, requires a separate proof.

" *Quest. 2.* If matter in its proper nature is incapable of thinking, cannot the Almighty communicate to it this property?

" This notion is usually supported by the authority of a great man, John Locke, who has suggested it in some part of his works. Since his time it has been repeated by many with a sort of triumph, as being unanswerable; but I believe the English philosopher himself never considered it so. The Cartesians taught, that if body were capable of thinking, the nature of thought must be found in the conceptions of extension and motion: but thought and extension, motion and perception, or our notice of motion, are unlike in nature, and belong to disparate properties; for join and transpose the corporeal parts as you will, there results no idea of the transposition, no perception of the change effected by it. Hence they concluded, that motion only belongs to what is extended, and that thought belongs to what is unextended and incapable of motion. As it seemed to be proved in this way that perception is not in the nature of matter, Locke asked properly, whether the Almighty could not impart to matter a power which it does not possess in itself. But if what has been said under the preceding question be true; if, in order to perception, what is manifold in the object must become individual in the idea of it by the percipient subject, since matter is always compounded of parts; perception is as absolutely impossible to matter, as it is impossible that a square should be a circle. To resort in such a case to Omnipotence is to imitate the good woman, who hoped to get the first prize in a lottery without putting into it, because nothing is impossible to God. I do not, however, deny that the doubt suggested by Locke is removed in a very plain way by the Cartesian method. It is proved, that properties are not communicable, and that infinite power cannot impart to a substance a property which is not in its nature. Here I will insert a dialogue which passed between Hylas and Philonous, in which the latter has illustrated this thought by an example which brings it before the eyes.

" *Hyl.* If matter in itself cannot think, may not the power to think be communicated to it by the Almighty?

" *Phil.* We will inquire. The Almighty causes the rose to grow upon the thorn. How is this done? Is a new rose-bud created out of nothing every year at the season of roses, and set into the stem?

" *Hyl.* That is not done. The germ rather is contained in the thorn, from which the bud shoots out in its proper season.

" *Phil.* If any man should dissect the germ, and examine its structure through the microscope, will he not plainly perceive that the rose is developed out of the finely organized germ?

" *Hyl.* Certainly, if the instrument magnifies sufficiently.

" *Phil.* But if the Almighty would cause the citron to grow on the rose-stem, which now bears only the rose, must not this fruit, which is not natural to the plant, be created, and set into the stalk?

" *Hyl.* It cannot be otherwise : but then the fruit would only seem to grow upon the stem of the rose-tree, and not really grow.

" *Phil.* It seems to me, that in this case Omnipotence itself can cause only the appearance of growing. The rose-tree must therefore be changed into the citron-tree ; or, to speak more accurately, the thorn must be annihilated, and the citron-tree put in its place.

" *Hyl.* It is plain that, in this case, what has been supposed would be effected yet less, that is, a communication of properties.

" *Phil.* The citron must then be created, and united with the rose-stem ; but how ? The stem yields no fluid with which the fruit can be fed.

" *Hyl.* The Almighty provides it out of the air, or by some other means.

" *Phil.* True. Suppose now the stock to perish : has the citron lost any thing besides its supporter ?

" *Hyl.* Certainly not, since it neither grew out of the stock, nor was nourished by it : but how does this apply to our inquiry ?

" *Phil.* I believe we are not far from its solution. It is granted that matter in its own nature cannot think ; that is, by virtue of its interior structure it is capable of a boundless variety of forms, colours, and motions, but not of thought.

" *Hyl.* I grant that Descartes has proved this.

" *Phil.* The base of the power to think is not more in matter than the germ of the citron is in the rose-tree. Should God communicate to matter the power to think, must he not then create this especial power, and conjoin it with matter ?

" *Hyl.* It must be so according to our present example.

" *Phil.* But in this way matter would only seem to think, and the power to think would no more be a property of matter, than the citron would really grow upon the rose-tree.

" *Hyl.* I must admit it.

" *Phil.* The question, then, is properly, not whether the Almighty can communicate to matter the property of thinking—for this is impossible : but whether he can create a power to think, and connect it with a material system. And see, my friend, this is what our Creator has really done. He has united with a certain portion of organized matter an especially created power, and they make conjointly the living creature, man. As the fruit was lodged upon a foreign stem, so the power to think is connected with organized matter. The latter shall be dissolved, and the former shall lose only its transient supporter."

As a great part of the answer to the third question is hypothetical, and, though not discordant with acknowledged anatomical facts, was written without the benefit of more recent discoveries, I shall only annex the concluding passage :

" Since the brain is the organ of the soul, it must feel all the changes and every disorder of which that is the subject. In dissolution, that organ is no longer united with the soul, and its functions, as the organ of its feelings, must therefore cease. The soul cannot be dissolved like the brain, for it does not consist, as that does, of parts which are joined together according to the laws of a corporeal nature. It is an indivisible unity, which cannot be subjected to the laws of mechanism. Either it must cease to be, or it retires upon a central organ, which cannot be dissolved together with the brain : and, perhaps, as is the usual process of nature, with the destruction of the brain, it acquires a new organization. In all nature there is no decomposition without a new composition, no destruction of one form without the commencement in its invisible particles of a new form, which reveals itself in time to the senses. Every destruction tends to a formation, every death builds the way to a new life. To him who considers this conjecture too bold, there remains only the annihilation of the soul ; for as dissolution of

parts is out of the question, in no other way can a purely simple nature cease to exist, and a power to think must either actually think or cease to be."

In a subsequent part of the treatise the author states his reasons for the opinion, that the soul can neither feel nor think unless united with a portion of organized matter, an opinion in which, he says, most philosophers will agree with him. He might have added the higher authority of its accordance with the scripture doctrine of the resurrection of the body.

"But where do we find annihilation in all nature? What particle in the universe is lost? What original power is ever for a moment inert? The compound is dissolved; one body is moved by another; the direction of one force is changed by another; here there is a composition, there a resolution of forces; but extinction is not in nature. The physical forces of all bodies united cannot annihilate a sun-moat, cannot suspend the motive power of a single atom. They may act upon it, but not without suffering a change themselves. How small soever this change may be, it proves the existence of the reacting power, and shews the effect of a force which all nature cannot overcome."

When D'Alembert asks, how we can conceive two substances which have no common property to act upon one another, Mendelssohn replies by another question, Can we conceive better how matter acts upon matter? Is mutual action explained at all by the similitude of substances? When D'Alembert asks, what difference we can imagine, according to our custom of thinking, between absolute nothing, and a nature which is not matter, our German Metaphysician replies,

"M. D'Alembert defines matter, that which is extended and impenetrable: both extension and impenetrability are ideas which have, strictly speaking, their seat in the soul; but we ascribe the exciting causes of them to an external object, and this object we name matter: the subject in which the ideas exist we name the soul: with what reason do we affirm the subject must have, of necessity, the property of the object? Matter is at last (it is all we know of it) a nature that can excite in the soul the ideas of extension and impenetrability. Custom, we are told, says that the soul is nothing, if it is not material; that is, reason replies, a nature which has the ideas of extension and impenetrability is nothing if it cannot also excite them. With what reason can this be maintained? Between existence and non-existence there is a gulf which nature cannot pass: it can no more reduce into nothing, than create out of nothing. Here I ask not more for the soul than is conceded to me for every atom of steam; not more for the power to think, than is admitted in every simple power of motion. Were it the power of a compound being, the aggregate force might be resolved into its elements; but since it is not composed of elements, it cannot be destroyed in this way; and it is impossible for all the powers of nature to effect its total annihilation."

J. M.

ON THE CHRONOLOGY AND ARRANGEMENT OF THE GOSPEL NARRATIVES.

(Continued from Vol. IV. p. 768.)

BEFORE proceeding in the course which we have prescribed to ourselves, it seems desirable to give our readers a view of the contents of Mr. Greswell's volumes; partly to enable them to judge whether the "Dissertations

upon the Principles and Arrangement of a Harmony of the Gospels" are likely to afford them the information they may desire to obtain from the work; and partly as a justification of some of our strictures in our former article.

Subjoined to the Preface is a "Synopsis of the *Preliminary** Dissertations," which is designed to "facilitate the comprehension of their mutual coherency, and to give the reader a clearer perception of the number and variety of the topics discussed." The work, the author says he is aware, must at first sight appear "irregular and unconnected;" but he maintains that "there is, in reality, an intimate relation between the several subjects of the Dissertations, and the order in which one follows or precedes another."

Notwithstanding the aid of the Synopsis, however, it seems by no means feasible to frame any thing like a consistent, orderly whole from the treatises forming this work; and nothing that appears in it countenances the belief that Mr. Greswell's whole plan was laid before he commenced the execution of it. Even if method and coherency can be discovered in the general arrangement of the work, there is often a great want of unity in the parts of the several Dissertations. And separate from the author's extreme diffuseness, and immethodical style of writing, there is much which, for the object, is totally irrelevant, having no further connexion with it than that which earnestness of investigation sometimes establishes in the mind of the inquirer, by magnifying distant parts till they appear to him at least contiguous, while, in reality, they have little or no relation to each other.

The "fundamental principle" of his work, he states (p. xiii), rests "on the truth of the following propositions: 1. That the three last Gospels are regular compositions: 2. That St. Matthew's Gospel is partly regular and partly irregular: 3. That each of the Gospels was written in the order in which it stands: 4. That the Gospels last written in every instance were supplementary to the prior." Mr. G. means to assert, in the last proposition, that each Gospel is supplementary to those preceding it in the order of composition; which order, he maintains, is the same as that in which we find the Gospels in the common text; so that Mark was supplementary to Matthew, Luke to Matthew and Mark, and John to all the three. That the Gospel of *Mark* was *supplementary* to the Gospel of Matthew is obviously inconsistent with the phenomena of each; and that Mr. G. should burden the system of his Harmony with so gratuitous a difficulty, must be truly surprising to those who have not observed that, by the strength of his conviction, and the facility with which he overlooks difficulties, he often contrives to transmute objections against his opinions into imposing arguments for them.

The "fundamental principle" to which Mr. Greswell refers, we have not discovered; unless, indeed, it *consists* of the four propositions *on which* it rests: but this is not improbable, as there runs throughout his work a hasty vagueness of expression, by which, we apprehend, he has often deceived himself, and may mislead some of his readers.

The first volume consists of thirteen Dissertations, "with a number of Appendixes, or Supplementary Dissertations, where the nature of the case required them." "The first three (the author says) are all subservient to the fundamental principle of the work, considered as preparatory to a Har-

* This epithet, no where else employed, refers to the *Harmony* which was framed agreeably to the Dissertations.

mony of the Gospels ;” and they are intended to support the four propositions already stated.

In so extensive and voluminous a work, we might reasonably expect to find a good Alphabetical Index of subjects : but all the aid of this kind is a Table of Contents ; and though this seems intended for an analysis of the Dissertations, it is so inadequate to the object, that it gives no intimation of various topics in them which we had marked for consideration.

The titles of the three first Dissertations are, “ On the Regularity of the Gospels, and on their Supplemental Relation to each other—Historical Investigation of the Times [Dates] and Order of the Three First Gospels—On the Irregularity of St. Matthew’s Gospel.” Maintaining, in the course of them, several positions which are incapable of proof, and some which are inconsistent with each other, and arguing from these as if they were established by his reasonings, there is little on which the mind can rest with the satisfaction which the author obviously feels in his own conclusions ; and, indeed, in various cases the reasoning itself appears destitute of solidity. When we come to consider the “ peculiar texture of each gospel”—our second division—we shall have occasion to advert to some of Mr. Greswell’s opinions on the subject : here we will only point out two or three of those positions which afford an exemplification of some of our strictures.

The author sets out with maintaining (p. 3), that “ no history, as such, whatever be the subject to which it relates, can, consistently with its own nature and purposes, disregard the order of time.” He also maintains the *inspiration* and *infallibility* of the gospels ; and yet speaks of St. Mark (p. 34) as *rectifying* the transpositions of St. Matthew, and supplying his *deficiencies* ; and in vindication of the *original* and *equal* authority of the former, he afterwards appeals (p. 23) to his “ rectification of the order of St. Matthew where that was *inverted* and *irregular*.” He even asserts, (p. 40,) that “ it is just and reasonable, and necessary to the joint authority of all, that we should allow to *each* a separate and an equal weight. Admit their common inspiration, (he adds,) and we have no other alternative.”

What, then, can we say to the case where, according to St. Matthew (ch. viii. 5—10), the centurion *came* to Jesus, and *himself* intreated him to heal his servant ; while St. Luke’s narrative (ch. vii. 6, 7) expressly shews that the centurion did *not* come to him ? Each account cannot have an equal weight, because both could not be the fact. No difficulty whatever exists, if we allow that each recorded the occurrence according to the best of his knowledge ; and it is easy to perceive how that of St. Matthew may have originated, (especially if he were not himself an eye-witness,) from the transaction as recorded by St. Luke with circumstantial detail. It was the custom in the East for the messenger to deliver his message in the very words of his employer ; and the words of the centurion thus delivered would naturally be referred to the centurion himself as present, by those who did not themselves hear the details from accurately-informed eye-witnesses ; and might be so referred even by some of those eye-witnesses.

As to the *instructions* of Christ, the apostles surely stood upon a different footing from others ; since they received from their Lord (John xiv. 26) the promise of miraculous aid in the recollecting of his declarations. This does not require us to suppose that the very *words* were brought to their recollection ; but it affords solid ground for a perfect reposing confidence in their record, as it respects the *import* of his declarations. But in recording his *actions*, and the events which befel him, where is there even a plausible reason for the supposition that they or the other evangelists were inspired ?

The hypothesis that all were inspired, and equally so, is alike gratuitous, and baneful to the credibility of the whole. The doctrine of the Inspiration of the Scriptures at large, has made more unbelievers than any other cause, except the vices of professing Christians.—Mr. Greswell seems prepared to admit every thing. “The consequence of a common inspiration,” he adds to the passage already quoted from p. 40, “is a common infallibility—and, in a common infallibility, there can be no difference in degree nor variety of kind—all must be alike infallible, or none could be so.”—He must have written and even printed this before he entered into all the minutiae which the construction of his Harmony brought before him. In many parts he writes as those may who are not burdened by so groundless an hypothesis.

We may observe before we proceed, that when giving (p. 46) coincident passages in Matthew and Luke which, he contends, were not identical in time, he quotes the Received Text of Luke xi. 2—4. There seems to us no room to doubt that the prayer in Luke was delivered at an earlier period than the Sermon on the Mount, in which the prayer according to which we are to pray was delivered; and that the two prayers were not identical, we entirely agree with Mr. Greswell; but when he was pointing out *coincidences*, he should surely have employed a text which, as every critic must allow, at least approaches more nearly to the original than the Received Text. In this case, the differences between the prayer in Matthew and that in the amended text of Luke strike the mind more than their agreement. In the following parallel we arrange St. Matthew's text according to the plan adopted by Mr. Greswell in p. 47, and throughout his Harmony; employing Griesbach's text in Luke.

Matthew vi. 9—13.

Πατερ ἡμῶν,
ὃ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς,
ἀγιασθῆτω τὸ ὄνομα σου·
ἐλθὲτω ἡ βασιλεία σου·
γενηθῆτω τὸ θέλημα σου,
ὡς ἐν οὐρανῷ, καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς·
τὸν ἄρτον ἡμῶν, τὸν ἐπιούσιον,
δος ἡμῖν σημερον·
καὶ ἀφες ἡμῖν
τὰ ὀφειλήματα ἡμῶν,
ὡς καὶ ἡμεῖς ἀφιεμεν
τοῖς ὀφειληταῖς ἡμῶν·
καὶ μὴ εἰσενεγκῆς ἡμᾶς
εἰς πειρασμόν·
ἀλλὰ ῥύσαι ἡμᾶς
ἀπο τοῦ πονηροῦ.

Luke xi. 2—4.

Πατερ,
ἀγιασθῆτω τὸ ὄνομα σου·
ἐλθὲτω σου ἡ βασιλεία·
τὸν ἄρτον ἡμῶν, τὸν ἐπιούσιον,
δίδου ἡμῖν τὸ καθ' ἡμέραν·
καὶ ἀφες ἡμῖν
τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν,
καὶ γὰρ αὐτοὶ ἀφιεμεν
παντὶ ὀφειλοντι ἡμῖν·
καὶ μὴ εἰσενεγκῆς ἡμᾶς
εἰς πειρασμόν.

(Mr. G. does not copy the Doxology
found in the R. T. of Matthew.)

The conclusions to which the author comes near the close of the Third Dissertation—“On the Irregularities of St. Matthew's Gospel”—are stated in the following paragraph; and this gives a fair specimen of the system of assertion and inference which too much pervades the work:

“It cannot, then, now be doubted whether St. Matthew's Gospel is safely to be made, throughout, the basis of a Harmony for the rest—or not. The argument of those learned men [who they are, Mr. G. does not give his readers the means of knowing] who contend that, because he would write as

an eye-witness, he would write the most regularly of all, however plausible in theory, is completely false in fact. Nor, indeed, is it difficult to retort the argument; for one, like St. Luke, or St. Mark, who, though not an eye-witness, yet proposed to write an account of the same things—it might naturally be supposed, even humanly speaking, would take so much the greater pains to remedy this very defect; both to acquire a perfect knowledge of his subject, and to verify, in every instance, the order of his facts. [How could he, thirty years after their occurrence, when most of the facts, before the last portion of the history, were necessarily so independent of each other? With respect to Luke and Mark, the order of *information* must, in some cases, have been solely that of *place* or of *subject*.] Meanwhile, if St. Matthew, in particular, though he must have written as an eye-witness, has yet written at all irregularly, this may be a good presumptive evidence that he must have written early, while the recollection of the facts was still unimpaired—and among, and for, eye-witnesses as well as himself, whose own knowledge, or possibilities of knowledge, would supply omissions, or rectify transpositions, for themselves. [This sentence has not been quoted by us, though it might have been, as a specimen of the confused and careless style of writing which pervades a great proportion of the work; but we cannot avoid leading our readers to notice the addition ‘possibilities of knowledge,’ which must have been inserted in the copy, *currente calamo*, and which gives us to understand that St. Matthew left such of his readers as were eye-witnesses, to *rectify omissions* by *possibilities of knowledge*. Well for the author that his anomalies are surrounded with the lustre of academic halls! He concludes the paragraph thus.] Whether his Gospel was written first or not, I think there can be little doubt; [true, for there is only one other supposition, which has not been advanced by any one—that it was written *at the same time* with the others;] but whether it was written all at once, or at different times, and in the order of the divisions pointed out, may very reasonably bear a question.” —P. 186.

The suggestion in the last sentence would have been very reasonable, had it been applied to St John's Gospel; but St. Matthew's narrative—however *irregular* the establishment of St. Mark's order would oblige us to consider it—bears clear indications of having been intended for a continuous history.

But we proceed with our outline of the contents. The Fourth Dissertation discusses the date of the Passover succeeding our Lord's Baptism (John ii. 13); and Mr. Greswell maintains that the 20th verse means “forty-six years hath it taken to build this temple, nor is it yet completed.” Following this interpretation, he fixes upon A. D. 27 for the year of that Passover. On the best consideration we can give the subject, we agree with Mr. C. Benson (*Chronology*, p. 232) in regarding the common version as perfectly exact—“Forty-six years was this temple in building;” which leaves the date of the Passover to be determined by other considerations, except that it must have been later than A. D. 26. Mr. Benson considers the tense and meaning of *εκαδομηθη* as “directly adverse” to the interpretation which Mr. Greswell maintains; and we had come to the same conclusion independently of the opinion of that judicious critic. Mr. Greswell, according to his usual system, makes no reference to Mr. Benson's section on the subject.

To this Fourth Dissertation the author annexes three Appendixes. The first contains a detailed investigation to prove that Josephus, when he speaks of Herod's beginning to rebuild the Temple in the 18th year of his reign, dates from the time when he became sole king by the capture of Antigonus, A. D. 37, and not from his appointment, three years before, by the Roman Senate. If there had been any question, in the present day, respecting the

date of the commencement of Herod's reign, there might have been good reason for this investigation; but even then the minute induction which he gives, would have been needless for the author's leading purpose; and it has so much chaff in it, that it is extremely difficult to discern the grains that may be really productive. At the close he comes to a conclusion, as to the year of Herod's *death*, which we deem correct, but to which the previous reasonings did not seem to be pointing; and from this conclusion, as it seems, he draws an inference which Dr. Whately could not have taught him. The reader will judge:

"The result of all our reasonings, hitherto, [i. e. in the thirty pages preceding, designed, as it appeared, to shew Josephus's computation of the date of Herod's accession to the throne,] is to this effect; that the death of Herod cannot be placed either earlier or later than the spring quarter of A. U. 751. [B. C. 3.] The building of the temple, *therefore*, which was begun in the eighteenth year, and, being completed in a year and six months afterwards, coincided with the annual recurrence of a feast of Tabernacles, must have been begun about the time of a feast of Passover. It was begun, *then*, about the time of the Passover in the eighteenth year of his reign," &c.

This series of inferences our readers will find in p. 223 of the first volume of Mr. Greswell's work. It is quite unnecessary to analyze it; and we shall only add that it is but a specimen of a large class which might be selected from this production of the Clarendon Press.

Next follows an Appendix respecting "the reigns and succession of the Maccabæan princes," which has the merit of being very short. For its insertion in this work we see no sufficient reason.

The Third Appendix is "On the Time of the Deposal of Herod Antipas, AND on the Eclipse before the Death of Herod" [the great]. The first portion is introduced, because there is a coin of Herod Antipas, which, (the author argues,) if the time of his deposal could be ascertained, would be of use in fixing the year of his father's death. As this was done, by direct means, in the first Appendix, surely this disquisition of sixteen closely-printed pages might have been dispensed with; but, it appears, after the close of the investigation, that the author's object must have been to parry an objection which might be derived from this coin against the date he has assigned to Herod's death, viz. A. U. 751, or B. C. 3.

"It is not, however, my intention," he says, (p. 245,) "to reckon up all the objections which might be produced against this opinion, and to shew how insuperable they would be: I have noticed, or shall notice, only the two most plausible of the arguments in its favour—the testimony of the coin of Antipas, which we have hitherto been considering—and the supposed date of the eclipse, which Josephus proves [he means the statements of Josephus prove] to have some time or other preceded the death of Herod."

The attentive reader has presumed that the critic has misrepresented his author, and that "*this opinion*" refers *not* to 751 but to 750. In our vindication we must quote the preceding sentence. Mr. Greswell begins the paragraph with observing, that the opinions of the learned have not much fluctuated except between 750 and 751; and that some strong arguments which might be adduced for this latter date, he passes by for the present. Arguing summarily, he maintains, presuming the time of the Council of Berytus to be 749, that it is "absolutely impossible that the death of Herod could have happened so soon after it, as at the Passover of A. U. 750: it could not have happened before the Passover of A. U. 751, at the

earliest." And he then proceeds with the passage above cited, which necessarily refers to the latter date, 751. We presume that he had first stopped at 750: but (with that tendency to the accumulation of reasoning, without regard to relevancy or force, which so much characterizes this work) he unfortunately added the succeeding clause which, as introduced, destroys the connexion.—But we must forbear noticing these things. If the reader will take half the trouble to find out false reasonings, incuriæ, needless accumulations, &c., that we have to discover what is really solid and useful in the work before us, he will require no vindication of our strictures. Few will give the tenth part of the labour we have to either; and yet if a person is investigating the same subject, Mr. Greswell's conjectures and errors may often aid him in discerning the truth; and while we censure his omissions of reference to those critics who have defended opinions which he opposes, we readily yield him the praise of the *faithful* and (we see no reason to doubt) accurate statement of a vast quantity of learned data, which may assist others in coming to sounder conclusions than his own often are.

The question discussed in the second part of this Appendix, on the Eclipse before the Death of Herod, is of real importance; but this we shall have occasion to notice hereafter.

The Fifth Dissertation presents useful calculations and data respecting the computation of the Jewish Passovers and other feasts. The Sixth enters upon the difficult question of the 15th year of Tiberius Cæsar. In this the author does not even notice the cautious, and by far more useful examination of the subject by Lardner; nor the valuable investigations of Mr. C. Benson, which may be referred to as a contrast with Mr. Greswell's. Lardner felt difficulties which Greswell seems never to have perceived; and Benson, while he appears fully satisfied in his own conclusions, is not so presumptuous as to say with the learned Dissertator, (p. 272,) that, if Tiberius were actually associated with Augustus in the administration of the empire, he knows not "*from what date but the date of this association, an evangelical historian could possibly have deduced the years of his reign.*" Surely it was at least possible that he might date from the commencement of the sole sovereignty of Tiberius, after the death of Augustus; especially as all the heathen historians and Josephus did so, and as there is found no clear instance in which the joint sovereignty of Tiberius with Augustus has furnished the era of computation. All that can reasonably be maintained in favour of this mode of computation is, that Luke might *possibly* have dated by it; and that from the circumstance that he wrote in the *provinces*, which Tiberius's tribunician power peculiarly respected, it is less improbable that he did so, than if he had written at Rome.

Mr. Greswell's Seventh Dissertation is "on the beginning of the Government of Pontius Pilate." In the course of this, the author adduces some curious facts to shew that, according to the rate of travelling which prevailed in ancient times, a journey from Rome to Judæa would in summer occupy eight or ten weeks, and in winter much more. In reference to the latter period, he cites Nicias (in Thucydides vi. 21) as reminding the Athenians that it was a four months' voyage even from Sicily to Athens.

The Eighth Dissertation respects "the united, and the separate, duration of the ministry of John the Baptist, and of Jesus Christ;" in which (p. 294) he maintains first, generally, that the true date of the commencement of the personal ministry of our Saviour is also the true date of the termination of the personal ministry of John the Baptist; and then qualifies a position which could not possibly be maintained without such qualification, by refer-

ring the termination of the latter to the commencement of our Lord's public preaching in Galilee, which every reader of the gospels knows was after John was put into prison. In this way Mr. G. often makes a startling position; and then qualifies it so as to deprive it of every need of proof.—In this Dissertation there are, however, some valuable observations on the two-fold commencement of our Lord's ministry, first in Judæa, and secondly in Galilee; and on the other hand, some specimens of the too frequent accumulation of vague and useless data. To it is subjoined an Appendix on the time of the imprisonment of John the Baptist, and of the marriage of Herod and Herodias. Here, and in various other parts, the discussions of Mr. Greswell more respect the accuracy of Josephus, than the Harmony of the Gospels; but in this case they are not irrelevant.

Dissertation the Ninth is "on the Age of our Lord at his Baptism;" and, paying no attention to the opinion of those critics who (in Luke iii. 23) interpret ἀρχομενος on *beginning* his ministry, the author roundly asserts that "the genius and syntax of the original language, as well as the reason of the thing, will agree to no order of the terms, nor to any interpretation of the text but this—And Jesus himself was, as it were, beginning to be thirty years of age." The *reason of the thing* is against such a construction, for surely ὥστε "as it were" is useless with ἀρχομενος; and there is nothing *absurd* in the rendering, "Now Jesus was about thirty years of age on beginning:" and there is a presumption that it is not so very certain as Mr. Greswell represents it, that his is the only justifiable translation, when we see Grotius, Le Clerc, Rosenmüller, Schleusner, Griesbach, Paulus, Kuinoel, &c., as well as Petavius, Lamy, and Lardner,* adopting the reference of ἀρχομενος to the *ministry*, not the *age*, of Christ. It has long appeared to us that this was the meaning of the sacred historian.

"The time of the year when our Lord was born," forms the subject of the Tenth Dissertation: and this the author argues was "about the vernal equinox," and thinks was "in all likelihood—the 5th of April, and the 7th day of the week."—We may fix upon this Dissertation, extending to *fifty* pages, as affording ample illustrations, and as we think a full justification, of all the strictures we have given on the author's characteristic faults and style of investigation. To it he subjoins an Appendix of forty pages "on the date of the Exodus, and of the first Passover."

"This Appendix," says the Author in his Synopsis, p. xv., "proceeds upon the following supposition; that our Lord was born in the fulness of time on the tenth of Nisan and the fifth of the Julian April, B. C. 4, because [we intreat the reader to observe the reason—*because*] in the year of the Exodus from Egypt, and at the time of the institution of the Passover, the tenth of Nisan and the fifth of the Julian April coincided not only with each other, but with the vernal equinox. The year of this coincidence was B. C. 1560: the object of the Appendix is to prove that B. C. 1560 was actually the date of the Exodus."

Supposing that the author's system of *hypothetical chronology* were as well established as to us it seems groundless, what has all this to do with the "Principles and Arrangement of a Harmony of the Gospels," which appears, *in the title-page*, as the subject of his Dissertations?

The last three Dissertations in the first volume, the xith, xiith, and xiiith, are, "On the opinions of the most ancient Christians upon the preceding

* See Wolfii *Curæ*, in loco, and the very valuable *Commentarius in Libr. Nov. Test. Hist.* by Kuinoel: also Mr. Benson's *Chronology of our Saviour's Life*, p. 180.

topics.—On the census of Cyrenius, or the meaning of Luke ii. 2.—On the prophecy of the Seventy Weeks, and the first part of the chronology [the chronology of the first part] of the Acts of the Apostles.” Some remarks on the Author’s opinions in this portion of his work, may properly find a place hereafter.

The first Dissertation in the second volume continues the subject of the last Dissertation in the first volume; and with a view, as it seems by the title, to the Prophecy of the Seventy Weeks, gives the chronology of the second portion of the Acts, beginning at the 13th chapter. In this Dissertation, the Author gives us an investigation of the dates of the leading events in St. Paul’s apostolical labours, and also of his *Epistles*, including that to the Hebrews, occupying the first hundred pages;—forgetful, as it appears, of the judicious observation with which he cannot but be familiar, and which is alike applicable to works of philosophy and criticism, as to poetry:

Ordinis hæc virtus erit et venus, aut ego fallor,
Ut jam nunc dicat, jam nunc debentia dici;
Pleraque differat, et presens in tempus omittat.

We are of opinion that adherence to the Roman Poet’s canon would have reduced this work to a single volume at most. But we ought to state, that in the Author’s own judgment (Vol. I. p. xv.) the consideration of the prophecy of the Seventy Weeks “necessarily involved the question of the chronology of the first twelve chapters of the Acts of the Apostles”; and that the first Dissertation in the second volume “is intended to shew that the chronology of the Acts from the 13th chapter forwards, is not inconsistent with the order and distribution of the twelve chapters immediately preceding, as already given.” We wish the Delegates of the Clarendon Press had kindly severed the spider-like threads with which the Author has joined many of his excursive discussions to the legitimate purpose of his work.

The remaining part of the second volume, together with a large portion of the third, is given to that purpose; and though we have continually to complain of the extreme diffuseness and immethodical excursiveness of the whole, and are of opinion that it is generally founded on erroneous positions, yet to the subject-matter we have no objection to make. Of this portion we will give the Author’s own synopsis; both as a favourable specimen of the Author’s *power* of methodizing, and an indication of the subjects which he brings forwards and the opinions he maintains; and also, we frankly confess, to prevent our occupying more room with those animadversions, which scarcely a few consecutive pages of this work present themselves without provoking.

“It is the object of the second Dissertation to explain and reconcile the two genealogies, on the supposition that St. Matthew’s is the genealogy of our Lord’s reputed father, and St. Luke’s the genealogy of his real mother.

“It is the object of the third Dissertation to establish such a personal distinction between those who are called in common the *Ἀδελφοί* of Christ, as will reconcile the Evangelical accounts, and no longer leave any difficulty on this point.

“The fourth Dissertation, which treats of the visit of the Magi, endeavours to prove that the time of this visit was thirteen months posterior to the first appearance of the star, and four months posterior to the birth of Christ; and thence to infer that the star appeared *twice*, once at the Incarnation, and again at the Nativity.

“It is the object of the fifth Dissertation to harmonize and arrange the particulars of the ministry of John: and, preliminary to this, to define the

true nature and design of his ministry itself. This Dissertation also is connected with the general argument of Dissertation viii. in Vol. I.: and its chief purpose is to establish a necessary, but clear, distinction between the proper office and character of John, in which he agreed with those of Jesus Christ, and the truth of his personal relations to Jesus Christ, in which he differed from them.

“The sixth Dissertation endeavours to shew that, though St. Matthew’s account of the order of the temptations may be the true, St. Luke’s is not inconsistent with it.

“The seventh Dissertation carries forward the series of the Gospel history, and at the same time strictly exemplifies the supplementary character of the Gospel of St. John, by shewing that, beginning his narrative precisely where the other Evangelists had left off, he conducts it regularly down to the point of time where St. Luke, in particular, had begun again. To this Dissertation an Appendix is attached, designed to confirm a statement in the Dissertation itself, and involving the question of the computation of sabbatic years: one of which is shewn to have actually coincided with the first year of our Saviour’s ministry.

“The eighth Dissertation, which is divided into four parts, is designed to give a general preliminary or prospective survey of the whole course of our Saviour’s ministry, both in Judæa, and out of it. The first part is devoted to the consideration of the ministry in Judæa, and its object is to prove that, as St. John alone has given any account of this ministry, so he has given a complete account of it. Each of the three last parts is devoted to a separate year, down to the middle of the third year in particular, where the review will be found to stop short: and their common purpose is not merely to give the student of the Gospel history a clear view of the course and connexion of his subject beforehand, but to contribute to the general purpose of the work, by shewing with what facility the Evangelical accounts, duly arranged, may be made to fill up the periods of time allotted to them—to supply in a great many instances the most distinct proofs of the accommodation of the latter to the prior narratives—and to prepare the way for the discussion of particular questions by a better understanding of the grounds on which they proceed.

“The Dissertations, which follow from the *ninth* to the *fourteenth* inclusive, are accordingly all devoted to the discussion of such questions: the ninth being designed to prove the conclusion that the miraculous draught of fishes, in St. Luke, is no Trajection: the tenth, that the feast which ensued on the call of Levi is no Anticipation: the eleventh that the sermons from the mount were distinct, and may each be related in their proper place: the twelfth, proposing to reconcile St. Matthew’s account of the time and manner of our Saviour’s interpretation of the first of his parables with St. Mark’s, or St. Luke’s: the thirteenth, to adjust St. Mark’s account of the question concerning eating with unwashen hands to St. Matthew’s: the fourteenth, to investigate the proximate cause of the disputes concerning precedence, and at the same time to establish the proof of a luminous instance of the supplementary relation of St. Mark in particular to St. Matthew.

“It is the object of the fifteenth and the sixteenth Dissertations respectively, to prosecute the subject discussed in the eighth, and to exhibit another clear and decisive proof of the critical accommodation of St. John’s Gospel to the three first Gospels in general, and of St. Luke’s to the two first in particular.

“The seventeenth Dissertation has it in view to determine the locality of the village of Martha and Mary, so far at least as to prove that it was not Bethany: and by way of corollary to this disquisition to explain and illustrate the circumstances of the unction at Bethany.

“It is the business of the eighteenth Dissertation to compare the account of the dispossession in St. Luke with the similar account of St. Matthew;

the result of which comparison is to prove that neither of them is a transposition.

"The object of the nineteenth Dissertation is to point out the many critical indications of time, which occur in the twelfth chapter of St. Luke, and which all converge upon one and the same conclusion, that they belong to the last period of our Saviour's ministry.

"The object of the twentieth Dissertation is to render it probable that the destruction of the Galileans, alluded to at Luke xiii. 1, was a recent event, and a consequence of the sedition of Barabbas.

"The object of the twenty-first is to harmonize the accounts of St. Matthew and St. Mark, in reference to the question concerning divorce: and the object of the twenty-second, which concludes the volume, is, by the simple consideration of later and supplementary accounts, to remove every difficulty connected with the miracles at Jericho.

"The business of all the Preliminary Dissertations contained in the third and last volume, is to harmonize the several accounts of the Gospel history, from the time of the arrival at Bethany before the last Passover, to the day of the ascension into heaven. This object is effected through six consecutive Dissertations—of which the first ascertains more particularly the true date of the arrival at Bethany, and the true date of the procession to the temple: the second, the time of the cleansing of the temple: the third, the order and succession of events on the last day of our Lord's public ministry, and the time of the unction at Bethany: the fourth, the time of the last supper: the fifth, the course and succession of events from the evening of Thursday, to the evening of Saturday in Passion-week: the sixth harmonizes the accounts of the resurrection itself. The particular purposes, which each of these Dissertations also embraces, are too many and various to be comprehended under any general statement; and will be sufficiently evident from the Table of Contents itself.

"The remainder of this volume is taken up by a number of Appendices to the Preliminary Dissertations in general, the common purpose of all which is to supply some omission in former Dissertations of the work; and consequently the particular purpose of any one of these Appendices is subservient to that of the corresponding Dissertation, to which the reader is accordingly referred." Vol. I. pp. xvi.—xix.

The titles of the Appendices are, "On the Supplemental Relations of the Gospels—Principle of Classification as applied to St. Luke's Gospel—Chronology of the Kingdoms of Judah and of Israel"—which irrelevant matter, designed as supplementary to the useless Appendix of the tenth Dissertation in the first volume, occupies more than fifty pages—"Computation of Sabbatic Years—Journey of St. Paul from Philippi to Jerusalem—Rate of a Day's Journey—Time of the celebration of the last Passover—Miscellaneous Notes."

In what further we propose to lay before our readers, on the Chronology and Harmony of the Gospels, according to the order of subjects which we traced in the preceding volume, (pp. 763—768,) we shall have little occasion, we hope, for the style of animadversion which has hitherto marked our review of the Dissertations. We are desirous of stating what we deem substantial truth, without entering upon the examination of opposing opinions, unless these appear to have some real force. Following this course, we shall not be required to enter much upon Mr. Greswell's data and reasonings. We shall find opportunity of considering such as really bear against our own views; but if the principles we shall advance are just, there is comparatively little in those on which the peculiarities of Mr. Greswell's Harmony rests, that can have a solid foundation.

LINES

SUGGESTED BY SEEING AN INFANT ON ITS DEATH-BED.

LITTLE human lily! Meek flower unblown!
 By the scythe of the Reaper of nations mown,
 In "the dew of thy youth" thus call'd on high—
 Was it better to bloom till that dew was dry?
 But why, drooping blossom, ere life be fled,
 Do I number thee thus with the early dead?
 'Tis because the life-pulse of hope is low,
 And the grave of the snow-drop is dug in the snow.

Even now, while I give thee a stranger's sigh,
 Thy father watches thy glazing eye:
 Even now, while I give thee a stranger's tear,
 Thy mother thinks of her baby's bier.

Pass away, little spirit, and pass in peace!
 Thy pleasures are done—let thy pains too cease!
 How can we wish thee to drag in pain
 The few frail links of a breaking chain?

Part, little darling, in peace depart—
 Oh! hadst thou my future, and I thy heart!
 Part, little seraph, thy hour is come,
 And the Highest has call'd the pure one home.

I ask'd, and I had, the leave to look
 On the last pale leaf of thy closing book;
 'Twas white as the whitest rose in the wreath,
 With a word like a shadow—the word was Death.

I look'd in silence, and turn'd away,
 For I saw what I look'd on would soon be clay;
 Quick were the pants of the labouring breast—
 'Twas a motion that told of a long deep rest!

And there she lay, with a gleam of blue
 Just shewing the half-open'd eyelids through,
 A moist, a vague, and a sleepy gleam,
 As if Death had come like a wildering dream.

Our senses oft wander before we sleep,
 And then it falls, long, heavy, and deep;
 And often thus the half-conscious soul
 Reels on the brink of the mortal goal.

Is thy glad voice mute? Thy bird yet sings,
 When the morning strikes on his wires and wings;
 The rose loiters yet on the wintry tree—
 They are flowers for thy grave, but not for thee.

But other birds shall sing where thou art,
 With no music that comes from a broken heart;
 And flowers that blossom where no flowers die
 Shall gladden the meek young stranger's eye.

Yet, yet we will think that a day will break,
 Early or late, when the sleepers will wake—
 Oh that so earthless and undefil'd
 We might face the Sunrise of Life, sweet child!

'Tis we are the dead far more than thou—
 Long are the waters our barks may plough;
 And many a tempest, and many a cloud,
 Must shiver the keel, and sweep the shroud.

Yet with storm and cloud we may bravely cope,
 While on thy anchor we lean, sweet Hope!
 And thy two bright sisters, Love and Faith,
 Have a smile for Grief, and a shaft for Death.

Crediton, November, 1830.

J.

EARLY RELIGIOUS INSTRUCTION—CHILDREN'S BOOKS.

WE have been greatly interested by the progress of an amicable discussion carried on in several successive numbers of the Boston "Christian Teacher's Manual," on the propriety of separate and suitable public religious services for children; and it is a subject so nearly allied to the question of a separate literature, that we must take the liberty of offering a few remarks upon both. But let us not enter the field as, on this occasion, opposed in opinion to the Editor of the *Christian's Manual*, without expressing our value for that excellent little publication. Accustomed to admire the Boston *Christian Examiner*, it has been with yet greater pleasure that we have read its humbler looking companion. Of course, its tone is affectionate and gentle; no less could have been expected from the sources whence it emanates; but it is also independent, powerful; often calculated, by its spirit and manner, to rouse young people to self-exertion and energy; and it is free from dogmatism—free, also, from that disgusting appearance of patronage which spoils much of our juvenile literature. There is room for question of the Editor's judgment in introducing two or three of the German extracts; but it is to the individual pieces that we object—not to the attempt to bring before young persons specimens of the free and unsophisticated writings of that wonderful people; and, even in our doubts, we think it right to call to mind the fact that some German books for children, which now so exceedingly offend our taste as to disqualify us from forming a fair judgment of their merits, not only impressed our own childish minds in the most salutary way, but are, we firmly believe, of abiding service to numberless individuals. One reason for this may be, that we do not remember an instance in which honesty and good faith are violated in these books: they tell stories of the good and bad, it is true, but they never inculcate, by parental authority, a low, selfish, and calculating morality: and they make the rewards of virtue to consist chiefly in peace of heart, and sympathy with the excellent of the earth. To return, however, to the *Christian's Manual*. We particularly admire the translation of Luther's Paraphrase on the Lord's Prayer, the Conversation on the Use of Manuals, some part of the Remarks on Sunday-Schools, and the Letter to a Mother, No. I. New Series.—In this number

we have observed a query respecting the priority of authorship of a story in Mrs. Barbauld's Lessons; that of "*The Idle Boy*." It is related both by Mrs. B. and M. Berquin, and as the manner of telling it is somewhat different, we are curious to know who was the first narrator. The Frenchman's introduction of the father, with his superfluous bounty, seems to us no improvement.

"There was once a very small child; for if he had been larger I dare say he would have been more wise; but this was not much higher than the table. His mamma sent him one day to school. The weather was very fine; the sun shone without clouds; and the birds sang upon the trees. The little boy would have liked better to run in the fields, than to go and shut himself up with his books. He asked the young girl who was leading him, if she would play with him; but she answered, My friend, I have other business to do. When I have led you to the school, I must go to the other end of the village for some wool for my mother to spin; if I did not, she would have no work to do, and she would earn no money to buy bread.

"A moment after he saw a bee, who was flying from one flower to another. He said to the girl, I should like to go and play with the bee. But she answered, that the bee had something else to do; that it was busy in flying from flower to flower, to collect from them something to make honey of: and the bee flew away to its hive.

"Then a dog passed by: the little boy would have liked to play with him; but a hunter, who was near, blew his horn, and directly the dog ran towards his master, and followed him to the fields. He soon started a partridge, which the hunter shot for his dinner.

"The little boy went on his way, and he saw near a hedge a bird which was hopping about; Ah! said he, that little bird is playing all alone: perhaps he will like me to go and play with him. Not at all, answered the young girl, the bird has got something else to do. He must collect from all quarters straw, wool, and moss, to build his nest. At the same moment the bird flew away, holding in his beak a large piece of straw that he had just found; and he went to perch upon a great tree, where he had begun to build his nest among the leaves.

"At last the little boy met a horse on the border of a meadow. He wanted to go and play with him; but a farmer came by, who led away the horse, saying to the little boy, 'My horse has other business to do, than to come and play with you, my child: he must come and help me to cultivate my fields, otherwise the corn could not grow there, and we should have no bread.'

"Then the little boy began to think: and he soon said to himself, 'Every thing which I have met has something else to do than to play: I must do something better, as well as the rest. I will go straight to school and learn my lessons. He went directly to school and learnt his lessons quite well, and received the praises of his master. This was not all: his father, who was informed of it, gave him the next day a large wooden rocking-horse, to reward him for so much application. Now, I ask you, if the little boy was not glad not to have lost his time in play?'—Christian Manual, pp. 15, 16.

The Editor of the Christian Manual advocates the separation of the old and young in our public Sunday services, if we understand him aright. He thinks it unreasonable to require children's attention to public worship as conducted among adults, and would consequently have them instructed by teachers of their own. This is no new idea, but it is one deserving very serious consideration. We are no advocates for bringing children to public worship at all, till they have some just and general idea of the purposes for which the multitude is brought together. But, at a very early period, this idea may be formed in their minds; they may be, and are, fully capable of sympathy with father or mother in the work they are performing. There is

something, indeed, exceedingly chilling in the doubt that the spirit of devotion may not, on these occasions, warm the hearts of the young as well as the old; though, when the parent's attendance on public worship is an act different in spirit and character from the rest of life; when the child sees no religion but a Sabbath-religion, it cannot be expected that its own devotion should be kindled. But we have in view better cases than these, and, this supposed, it is no exaggerated thing to believe that even a young child may be bearing a part in acceptable worship. Still the plea of greater suitability to the comprehension of the young, is urged in behalf of separate services. And who is to judge of the suitability? The mind of one child may, for aught we know, and even for aught that a parent knows, be in a state of far greater advancement than another, and to keep it in the juvenile congregation will, perhaps, be disgusting it for life. So few men, so very few, know how to address children, *as* children, aright, that we are exceedingly sceptical as to this whole matter of adaptation to the wants and wishes of the young. Could children speak out, were they not often checked by a fear of saying something wrong, or were there not, in their little minds, a host of undefined feelings which they have not yet learned to clothe with language, it might be found that no sermons please or strike them so little as those made expressly for them. There is a kind of preaching, indeed—a hard, cold, metaphysical style—from which they can never be supposed to glean the smallest benefit. But whom *does* such a style benefit? And who would be the worse for getting rid of it altogether? The best preachers, by far, are those of whom we may predict that their earnestness, simplicity, pathos, and affectionate zeal, will procure for them an early attention from, and constantly growing power of comprehension by, children. There are passages in the sermons of Dr. Channing—that splendid one, for instance, on the Ordination of Farley—in which he introduces the names of the great of former days, of Fenelon and Howard, of *Alfred* and Washington (names which ought to be as familiar as household words to children); there are passages of this kind, scattered up and down the writings of Dr. Channing, high and above the ordinary range of sermon-writers as he is, which we cannot help thinking a well-educated child would treasure up and bear in his mind; while of the sermon “on the Duties of Children,” by the same hand, it is only remembered that such an one was preached, and that it seemed as cold and comfortless as such pieces of good advice generally are. And, if even Dr. Channing has failed in a case like this, where are we to find preachers for our children? To whom shall such an office be entrusted? How easy, to the mind of the self-sufficient! To him who has taken a just measure of the difficulty, how arduous! We mean not to hold up the public services designed for adults as bringing to children a sufficiency of religious instruction; for this, either at home or in the Sunday-school, there is still ample room, and there it is best dispensed in the most familiar style. We only wish still to have the sight of the parent and child attending together in the house of God, preserved to the Christian community. Let not refinements and distinctions creep in here. A general impression of affectionate duty, the feeling that makes a child unwilling to be left behind when its mother goes to church, uninviting as the services may appear, is a very harmless beginning of a valuable habit; and, farther, children may have real sympathy in the pious purposes of a beloved parent, while yet unable to follow far in the actual services: they do not like always to go to school, and be addressed by the schoolmaster. The voice that speaks kindly and admonishingly to their elders, is heard by themselves without suspicion, or question-

ing, or any of that *esprit de corps* which cleaves to children when ranged in the presence of a task-master: and happy that preacher on whom the eyes of the younger members of his flock delight to rest! Happy he who has proved himself their friend by many a kind act, and who thence derives a part at least of his power to win their attention! We cannot help earnestly wishing that our ministers would, for their own sakes, endeavour to gain a strong interest in the hearts of children. To preach to them unseasonably, to take them to task for their offences, to interfere between them and their parents, is not what we want: but who shall say how often a common affection for the man whose office it is to confirm all good impressions by the holiest of sanctions, might not remove asperities on both sides, dislodge objectionable fancies, and strengthen the bonds of family union? We feel that we cannot afford to lose children out of the congregation, whenever we consider how serviceable such agency might be to him who knows how to use it. Our artificial divisions, as well as associations, are to be zealously watched over, lest they rob us of substantial general good, under the notion of procuring some special advantage.

Our doubts respecting the propriety of establishing a separate form of public worship for children are considerably strengthened whenever we examine our juvenile books, those overflowings of the love of communication. Of these many, many little volumes, how few breathe the generous spirit of Christianity! How do they abound in interested maxims, in selfish calculations of what will bring the largest outward reward, the least external punishment! When they are moral, how often are they dull! When religious, how dogmatical! A notable instance of low and interested reasoning, in a newly-published volume sent forth by Messrs. Harvey and Darton, has just caught our eye.*

"Children," says the author, (addressing, of course, children,) "miserably deceive themselves when they attempt to deceive their parents. Artful conduct, schemes, contrivances, disguises, and every cunning form of *seeming otherwise than they really are*, may, for a very little while, mislead their papa and mamma—but (mark, reader!) *parents are wonderfully quick-sighted*, and it cannot be long before such deception is discovered and condemned."

And what, again, is to be said for the goodness of forestalling scepticism?

"You are too young at present, as papa told you, to understand thoroughly even what is known as to the cause of this beautiful combination of colours (*in the rainbow*). But I must *earnestly charge you* not to suffer the very little you do know to make you turn caviller, and lead you to discredit what you read about the rainbow in your Bible"!!!†

Yet this little work is not *remarkable* among books, either for defectiveness or excess, and its faults are perfectly consistent with a well-intentioned zeal, and a spirit of affection which may neutralize much of its evil. We have only adverted to it as a specimen of the manner in which direct instruction to children on moral and religious topics is apt to be abused. The obscurity of men, when speaking to men, is not so much to be dreaded, as the effect of dogmatism and self-sufficiency. Where they write for one another, they do not venture to lay down with authority such questionable systems of morality, and they are often forced into modesty of expression, and regard to the opinions of others; but the preacher and the writer for children seldom adverts to the possibility of his being himself in the wrong.

* "Children as they Are." P. 265. London. 1830.

† Ibid. P. 67.

For this reason, among others, we have often been tempted to regret that children are allowed, in our day, so little time for exploring more manly books, and that the very desire to do so is stifled in its rise by the constant succession of abridgments, compilations, and juvenile periodicals. Miss Edgeworth deserves our thanks for having taken every opportunity of apprizing her little readers that there *are* large books in which they may find things which will delight and instruct them; but a considerable share of the spirit of enterprising curiosity is required to lead a child from his own well-filled shelves, groaning with elegant Lilliputian literature, to papa's plainer and more heavy-looking library.

How much beauty is there in Mrs. Barbauld's Lessons! And yet we never can cease to regret that some few objectionable passages in them were not struck out before the hand that wrote them first was cold in the grave. Why should the little naughty boy who was cruel to his bird be denied a pretty name? Or why should goodness be connected with *a name* at all? And why resort to the improbable retributive justice recorded in the sequel? These things are vexatious, as coupled with such excellence. No veneration for an individual can ever reconcile us to superficial and faulty motives being inculcated on children. Miss Edgeworth too—wise, quick, and penetrating, as she is—why should she ever have contemplated dispensing a school prize* “to the most amiable”? Can any thing be less amiable than the spirit in which a number of school-girls would be likely to contend for such a reward? Of writers for young people, Miss Aikin seems to us to deserve great gratitude. There is much negative as well as positive good in what she has done for them, and we trust this will seem to the reader, as it does to ourselves, to involve high praise. There are, indeed, numbers of books for children which contain useful and pleasing things, but the great, the lasting difficulty is, to meet with one that does *no harm*; and in saying this, we have an eye as much to *manner* as *matter*. What we like in Miss Aikin's Lesson Book for the Junior Classes,† is its scrupulous correctness as to facts of nature or real life, combined with a rare abstinence, in most cases, from advice-giving and moral-making, its perfect good taste, a spirit of good temper, a hearty interest in the beauties of creation, and on the harmony of the human heart with the fair-proportioned whole. She has not entered deeply into the life of children, but it is better to go but a little way and do it well, than to make large professions and fail. In her own department she is eminently happy; the execution, indeed, of what she does attempt is so excellent as often to have made us regret that her essays have not been more numerous: they might fill up a blank in our literature, and distance alike some of our absurdly romantic tales, and our dull moralities, while they would in no way interfere with the province of direct religious instruction.

In noticing children's religious books, how difficult to steer a just course! Practically, we have by no means that extreme horror of tales of the Calvinistic school which sways many of our Unitarian brethren, though to very little children we certainly would not give them. We do not think the chances of their doing an injury to the mind of a young person are to be named with the dangers connected with errors such as those we have pointed

* Parents' Assistant—"The Bracelets."

† "A Lesson Book for the Junior Classes. By Lucy Aikin." Hunter. We wish it had a prettier title. The quiet pleasantry of "the Cuckoo and Magpie," and the very pleasing piece entitled "the Pearl of Price," deserved this.

out in "*Children as they Are.*" Is there any thing so *very* appalling in their being acquainted with the fact that a great difference of opinion exists among good people respecting certain doctrines? We have never found it difficult to make them comprehend and view these subjects candidly, and differ from those who would rob them of the advantage of knowing very early that there is good on all sides. It is a parent's business to prepare the way for these things; but that child must be ill prepared indeed, to whom a strong doctrinal expression can do harm. It may lead to inquiry: and we know no evil in this. Whatever is written in perfect honesty and good faith, with love to God and love to Jesus, and good-will to man interwoven with its teachings, cannot surely be a thing to excite a parent's just dread. It is not that we are indifferent to unscriptural statements and superstitious notions: far otherwise: but we sincerely think that parents are too anxious about accordance with their own *opinions*, and not solicitous enough respecting *principle*. If what appears to them a *truth* is stated, they are not sufficiently anxious to inquire whether the manner in which it is stated does not involve some sacrifice of the high tone of morality. However, we should fervently rejoice to see many of the books we have in view purified from their objectionable things, and to hail the multiplication of such as, while they are free from similar defects, are, at the same time, interesting and able. Our Unitarian volumes for children have been too often frigidly accurate, and laboriously dull. But they are improving. We trust a freer, more generous spirit is coming in. Unitarians will learn to look at Christianity less as it is anti-calvinism, abstractedly from the hurtful and narrowing and corroding view of its corruptions. Let them give themselves up to it as one with all that is noble in principle, beautiful in feeling, and lively and inspiring in operation. Then, and then only, will they rise above the depressing thoughts of what is earthly, into the light of the heavenly. We hail such books as Mr. Greenwood's *Lives of the Apostles*, and Mr. Ware's *Jotham Anderson*, as inestimably valuable to young people. In these, there is *heart*: as much may be said of that beautiful little work, "*Gospel Examples.*" Such of the American children's books as have been noticed in the *Boston Christian Examiner*, have, we must confess, disappointed us on more intimate acquaintance. Many of those published by Messrs. Bowles and Dearborn are prosing and heavy, the style inflated, and the narrative poor. We must, however, except "*Winter Evenings in Boston,*" which, though immeasurably inferior to "*Evenings at Home,*" is a work of great merit.—It is time to close these very miscellaneous observations, and yet, since children, and the improvement of children, is our theme, we cannot forbear adverting to a late article in the *Christian Examiner* on "*Early Religious Instruction.*" It is there supposed that a child is inquiring who made the flower which delights its senses by its beauty and fragrance. The parent's answer is to be, unhesitatingly, "*God;*" and the *Christian Examiner* delights himself in thinking that the name of the Deity will thenceforth be associated in the child's mind with one of his most beautiful works. But why should not the idea have been more firmly established in the infant being by a short suspension of the satisfaction of its curiosity, while it is aided, as kindly and gently as possible, in the examination of those circumstances in the growth of a flower which have a human origin, and those which cannot be accounted for by any visible agency?

Give a child a mere *name*, and you are near giving it stones when it asks for bread; but let it feel and distinguish the effect of a Power which it does not see, let it trace this Power allied with goodness, with the production of a

beautiful effect, and the impression on its mind will be as living and permanent as that mind itself. Who can doubt which is nearest to a true knowledge of God, the child who, from our assertion, has learned the name of the Maker of the flower, and rests there; or he who *feels* the existence of a Power capable of producing such effects, without as yet knowing his name? There is great beauty in some conversations on this subject in a tale by the Rev. Henry Duncan, "*The Cottager's Fireside*." The existence of a Creator and Preserver has been made manifest to the child, and her heart has been touched by the proofs of his fatherly kindness, but yet, familiar as she had been with the name of God as her Maker, through means of her Catechism, so entirely unfruitful has it proved, that she is quite at a loss to comprehend of whom her uncle is now speaking. "But, uncle," she says, "I thought *God* made me, for the *Caritchies* says sae, and mammy says that God lives in heaven, far above the skies." We are too anxious about giving the name, before we have led the way to the feeling that there is a Power in the universe, the existence of which is demonstrated to us as well as the child by its effects. Hence the idea is not a living one in the child's mind, and bears no fruit. In giving religious instruction, we cannot be too careful that the spirit of the child should co-operate with all we do. The idea of putting religion into the mind as we would put learning, is a most fatal one. We may teach it the external facts of Christianity; indeed, those it is every way unwise to withhold; for the facts of our religion, and especially the life, death, and example of Christ, are most beautifully adapted to arouse and stimulate the spirit: but religion itself cannot be given by one being to another, for it is the communion of man with his Maker, the intercourse of the Father of spirits with our spirits, and all human teaching is serviceable only as it leads us to feel the closeness and the extent of the union by which HE, the great Parent of all, has made us His.

CRITICAL NOTICES.

THEOLOGY.

ART. I.—*Discourses on the Office and Character of Jesus Christ.* By Henry Ware, Jun. Second Edition. Boston, U. S.

If this highly valuable series of Discourses has not yet received formal notice in our pages, it is not because we have thought little of its claims to whatever we can offer in the way of recommendation to the Christian community. Mr. Ware's "*Jotham Anderson*" is well known; as the author of several beautiful devotional poems, particularly one, first published in the *Christian Examiner*, entitled "*Seasons of Prayer*," his name

has also for some time been familiar to many of our readers; and to ourselves it has long appeared that his modest and unpretending volume of Sermons on "*the Character and Offices of Jesus*," is one of the best presents which a Unitarian minister ever bestowed on his own flock, and the family of co-worshippers throughout the world. It is no collection of vague generalities, of tedious common-places. Without rising into absolute eloquence, the style appears to us pure, easy, and elegant—never cumbersome, never affected—above all, never dull. We should say that the spirit is throughout that of a genuine lover of

our great Master—of one who had deeply and affectionately meditated on his life and precepts—one, too, who had not excluded from his mind the contemplation of Heathen virtue in its highest forms, but, full fraught with the recollection of what was best in the sages of elder times, had come to the reading of the gospel, and found its wisdom deeper, its spirit purer. Mr. Ware's object is one of no mean extent. The survey of our Saviour in the various relations in which he stands to us, is in itself a very animating and vast one; and though we remember that it chiefly treats of what has been done and is doing for man, rather than what he is to do for himself by means of the grace bestowed upon him, every Christian must surely feel the connexion in which he stands to the great First-born from the dead, as one of the most interesting subjects which can occupy his thoughts. This subject is Mr. Ware's, and though one alone, it is most glorious and comprehensive in its unity.

With some ministers, the Saviour is not made a sufficiently prominent object; with others, "to round the closing period with his name," is very essential, and this constant repetition, accompanied by the frequent genuflection, wearies and often disgusts us in the services of the Established Church. Among the Evangelical part of the clergy, the same blessed name is repeated, as if mercy were centered there, and nowhere else throughout the wide creation; but, with Mr. Ware, there is no such imperfection or disproportion. Christ is the effect of a Father's mercy and love, the Saviour is the kind gift of one willing to save; the beautiful precepts he gave, and the light he threw upon the counsels of Almighty God, are not put before us as things utterly foreign to the previous ideas and capacities of the human race; on the contrary, it is because they are so suitable, so consonant to expectation, so conformable in all things to what we should have looked for and to what we want, that we find unceasing reason to treasure and revere them.

We do not make extracts from Mr. Ware's volume, for it is so small and so marvellously and modestly cheap, that it ought to be in the hands of almost every reader. We particularly recommend it to our chapel libraries.

ART. II.—*Sermons on the Principal Festivals and Holydays of the Church.* By the Rev. Arthur T. Russell, S. C. L. of St. John's College, Cambridge.

WHERE did the author of this volume concoct the following passage? It is so much above, in spirit and expression, the rest of his book, that we transcribe it with real pleasure, only wishing heartily we could find more such, and we would praise and quote accordingly. But, spite of the absence of originality and impressiveness, we have at least found subject for commendation in the utter absence of pretension. We cannot for a moment question the entire sincerity of the author, but we do question his experience and reflection, or why does he speak of some people fearing that "they cannot make up their minds to love God as they ought"? Love is not surely a matter of mental determination, though the removal of obstacles to its growth and increase may be so.

"If, by loving God, we meant the mere contemplation of the pleasures of heaven, and of the consolations of religion, the raptures of praise, and the complacent wanderings of the imagination, many might then say that they loved God. For many thus seem to themselves to dwell in paradise: but they walk not with God among the trees of this garden. They build to themselves a temple, but themselves form the glory of it, not the light of God and of the Lamb. Nay, in this paradise and temple the spirit of self is still alive, and opens and shuts the gate at pleasure; and from this fancied heaven the rain descends not on the evil and on the good: the sun shines not on the just and on the unjust; for all this enchantment is the heaven of self and of pride, not of the great God, who is love."—P. 178.

We differ from the conclusion, "Such is the heaven of the *proudly devout*," for we know of no devotion which is proud, nor any pride that is devout. We have noted one very singular expression in the Sermon on Good Friday:

"We therefore *plead the cause of blood*. The blood of the Son of God is upon you; do not trample upon it," &c. Of the Sermon on Trinity Sunday we can only say, that its argument seems to us exceedingly weak, and that we cannot understand how its author could venture to print any thing so loose and so imperfectly put together, on such a subject. Such is the ignorance prevailing among

village congregations, indeed, generally, that, so long as the minister quotes Scripture, he is allowed great latitude of misapplication; but it is otherwise when a sermon-writer appears in print. We have sometimes wished it were possible to peep into futurity, with a special view to eyeing the state of our Church of England. It is really a curious subject of speculation. We are not thinking of her externals now; but is it possible that, a hundred years hence, congregations all over a Christian land will be repeating, as part of the expression of *their own* feelings, David's bitter curses upon his enemies? Will they really with their united voices pour out the expressions of triumph over "Sihon, king of the Amorites, and Og, king of Bashan"? No part of the service so much excites our wonder as this. Is no change ever to take place? Yes, a change *has* taken place—and it has been dwelt upon with feelings of great complacency. Whether the burden of the *last* verse of a Psalm fall upon the clergyman or the clerk, it is now customary for the former to *begin* each Psalm. It is now possible for him to read a verse out of his turn. We cannot recollect the name of the Bishop who has brought about this revolution; but it is of about three years' standing.

The Church must do far more than this. Society is moving on and on—not always for the better indeed—but still it is on the move—and if it does not always discern and practise the thing that is right, it is opening its eyes to that which is wrong. We wish all the members of the Church satisfaction with her ordinances, so far as they are pure and scriptural; and many, very many, of them contain much that is of the spirit of Christianity; but they must root out some of the tares—the hour is come. Let them do it "now while it is called to-day."

ART. III.—*A Discourse on the Authenticity and Divine Origin of the Old Testament, with Notes and Illustrations.* Translated from the French of J. E. Cellérier, by the Rev. J. R. Wreford. London. 1830.

THE original of this publication, and its companion, the discourse *De l'Origine Authentique et Divine du Nouveau Testament*, were reviewed with deserved commendation in our number for October, 1829.

The English language has been much corrupted by translations from the

French, made, as booksellers' speculations, by persons whose needs were greater than their abilities. It would be easy to illustrate this remark in instances of Gallicisms in words, in meanings, in constructions, introduced by ignorance, and propagated by affectation. It is important, therefore, that the work of translation should be in the hands of persons fitted by education to execute the task. We cannot, then, be otherwise than glad that Professor Cellérier's volume has been presented to the English reader by one so competent, as he has proved himself, to preserve both the meaning of the original and the purity of the version. We are also indebted to Mr. Wreford for a few notes, whose value makes us desirerate more. This indeed we may say of the whole of the volume, and we therefore hope that the sale of it will be such as to justify him in carrying into effect the intimation which he has given in his preface, by translating Professor Cellérier's *Discourse on the Authenticity and Divine Origin of the New Testament*. A lower price on the present publication would probably have promoted this desirable object.

ART. IV.—*Selection of Psalms and Hymns, for Social and Private Worship.* By L. Lewis. Dorchester.

THE writers of Hymns lie under very peculiar hardship. Divorce one of Moore's Anacreontics from a National Melody, and publish it, and you will be presently visited with legal inflictions. Form a selection of poetry, and borrow as largely as you please from the stores of other writers, but alter not, or you will subject yourself to a storm of indignation from the respective authors. But take their HYMNS, change words, lines, stanzas; add, alter, mutilate as you will; only serve your own purpose—and no one, it would seem, has a right to find fault. "The names of their respective authors being of course omitted," it is no sin and no shame.

There are, however, several strong reasons against this common practice. The Hymns which are associated in the minds of Christian worshipers with the recollection of dear and venerated fellow-servants of Jesus, cannot be disjoined by the circumstance of the name being omitted in one or two collections. But the verbal, and, by degrees, the more important corruptions of the text, will certainly make their way. Succeeding Editors restore the name, but often

neglect to repair the damage, and thus an author is made responsible for words and sentiments which he never put together. It may be very true that the alteration is, in some cases, an improvement; yet we should ourselves prefer bearing the disgrace of having written a bad line, to the chance of being praised for good lines which were none of ours: and, excepting where the doctrine is so objectionable as to annihilate all sympathy between ourselves and the writer, we much prefer that devotional compositions should be left as their authors left them. There is a peculiarity in every man's way of viewing religious subjects, and the substitution of even one word for another is in some cases sufficient to diminish greatly the value of the whole. Why should Cowper's beautiful introduction of the solitary Bird of Night, in the Hymn,

"Far from the world, O Lord! I flee,"

be made to give place to such a line as this,

"There, in high ecstasy, she pours," &c.?

And why, above all, is Mrs. Barbauld's exquisite poem,

"Sweet is the scene when virtue dies!"

to begin,

"How bless'd the righteous when he dies!"?

And, if the two succeeding stanzas must be omitted, what hand has had the temerity to substitute for them the following?

"A holy quiet reigns around,
A calm which life nor death destroys;
Nothing disturbs that peace profound,
Which his unfetter'd soul enjoys."

Not many alterations are introduced in such of Mr. John Taylor's beautiful Hymns as are reprinted by Mr. Lewis. What there are, however, are no improvements. But we wish that a charming Hymn of Sir J. E. Smith's could have been allowed to escape as well. We allude to No. 420 of the Norwich Supplement. In Mr. Lewis's Selection the first and second stanzas are omitted; the two next, as the excellent author wrote them, stand thus:

"Still may thy children, in thy word,
Their common trust and refuge see;
O bind us to each other, Lord,
By one great tie, the love of Thee!

Here, at the portal of thy house,
We leave our mortal hopes and fears;
Accept our prayer, and bless our vows,
And dry our penitential tears."

But Mr. Lewis prefers the following reading:

"Unite us to each other, Lord,
By one great bond, the love of Thee.
Now, at the portal of thy house
We leave our earthly care and fear;
Accept our praise and bless our vows,
And our united pray-ers hear."

An anonymous Hymn, in the Norwich Supplement, and also in the Liverpool Renshaw-Street Collection, beginning,

"Come to the House of Prayer,"

has also the benefit of an "entirely new arrangement" of its concluding two stanzas, which, at the same time, we allow had great capabilities for improvement. Dr. Drummond also passes under revision:

"No balm that earthly plants distil
Can soothe the mourner's smart,
No mortal hand, with lenient skill,
Bind up the broken heart;"

is thus given—

"No earthly balm can heal this ill
Or soothe the mourner's smart,
No mortal hand, with lenient skill,
Can bind the broken heart."

We should be sorry Mr. Lewis should understand these observations as implying a strong, individual censure upon himself. He has only done what numbers beside think themselves fully authorized to do, for the attainment of what they consider to be a good, and many have taken far greater liberties. Nevertheless, holding it to be a sacred maxim, that we should not "do evil that good may come," we object to all such trespasses upon the identity of an author's property, and think they ought to be discouraged to the utmost of our ability. The writer of a hymn, like the writer of any other poem, would mostly, we should suppose, prefer doing his work alone. If others think they can improve upon his ideas, let them, wherever it can be done, make the suggestion with frankness, and trust to its being received in a right spirit; but let them beware how they meddle with the long treasured memorials of the dead, for, in so doing, they run a great risk of gradually lowering the reputation of a writer who has no longer power to redeem his fame from the feebleness, perhaps absurdity, they have indirectly helped to connect with it.

ART. V.—*Evangelical Tracts* No. I.
The Genius of Christianity. By
 W. H. Furness.

WE wish to call the attention of our readers to this series of Tracts. The following announcement of his plan we give in the Editor's own words, expressing our hope, that such encouragement will be afforded by the public, as will enable him to carry it fully into effect.

"Those who have engaged in the benevolent work of visiting the sick and the poor,—who are accustomed to observe family worship in their houses—to supply their inmates with useful reading—to foster the religious sentiments of their dependants—and, generally, to improve the opportunities which their station gives them of promoting piety and goodness, will often have felt the want of suitable compositions. This want it is proposed to supply, in the series of Tracts of which this is the commencement. The pieces published will be simple in their language, affectionate in their spirit, and practical and devotional in their tenor; in other words, such as may be put into the hands of domestics, poor neighbours, and workmen, or such as are fitted to be read in the family circle, or such as may exhibit to Christians at large the essential truths of the gospel as they are held by those who believe that the Father alone is the true God. As the sole object which he has in view is to do good, the Editor will be determined in the choice of what he publishes by a regard to the usefulness, rather than the originality of the compositions which he may have at his disposal. But while the series will, for the greater part, consist of reprints, it will also comprise original pieces. In order to be enabled to carry into effect the design now commenced, the Editor respectfully and urgently solicits the aid of the friends of Christianity. By using the tracts for the purposes for which they are designed, by pointing out tracts or passages of works worthy of republication, and by furnishing original compositions fitted for the proposed objects, they may render him important aid.

"Communications addressed to the Editor of '*Evangelical Tracts*,' to the care of T. Forrest, Printer, Market Street, Manchester, will receive attention."

ART. VI.—*The Gifts of the Spirit.*
 Printed for R. B. Lusk, Greenock.
 Pp. 24.

A PAMPHLET of few pages, and bearing

a simple title, but which has produced no small stir in the North; the production of Mr. Erskine, the author of several treatises of a Calvinistic character.

The main object of this tract is to argue the probability of the continuance of the miraculous operations of the Spirit in the Christian Church. Our author is not satisfied with the reasons commonly assigned for the belief that they have ceased to exist; such as, that the purpose of them was merely to put God's seal and sanction upon the canon of scripture; and that, therefore, when that canon was completed, they ought to cease, as having answered their purpose; and 2ndly, that as they were in the primitive times enforced by the laying on of the hands of the apostles, they necessarily ceased with the cessation of the apostolic office.

"I now see another use of the gifts, namely, for edifying the body of Christ, and demonstrating the oneness of the body on earth with the glorified Head in heaven."—P. 5. In proof of this view of the spiritual gifts he refers to the following passages: Rom. xii. 3—8; 1 Cor. xii., xiii., xiv.; Eph. iv. 4—16.

"If miracles were intended to have ceased, I cannot but wonder at the following statements, and others, being made so indefinitely—I mean so unlimitedly; referring to Matt. xvii. 19, 20; Mark xvi. 17, 18; Luke x. 19. The power is connected with *faith*, and not simply with the attestation of the truth. And that the gift of the Holy Ghost is not exclusively connected with the laying on of the hands of *the apostles*, appears from Paul himself receiving it by the laying on of the hands of Ananias, Acts ix. 17; and from the falling of the Holy Ghost on the family of Cornelius, not by laying on of Peter's hands, 'but while he was yet speaking,' so that the cessation of the apostolic office does not necessarily imply the cessation of miracles."—P. 13.

The application made of this doctrine is to certain pretensions to miraculous gifts, which, strange to say, have been recently made in the west of Scotland; and which Mr. Erskine, in whose pamphlet we see proofs of a sincere sense of religion, and considerable cultivation of mind, believes to be well founded. Some particular examples are given in the pamphlet which is next noticed.

ART VII.—*A Letter to Thomas Erskine, Esq., in Reply to his recent Pamphlet in Vindication of the West Country Miracles.* By the Rev. Edward Craig, M. D., Oxon, Minister of St. James's Chapel, Edinburgh. James Nisbet, London.

MR. ERSKINE, the author of the preceding tract, has recently adopted, it seems, some modification of his religious opinions, which has set the regular orthodox in array against him. This might be well enough. A great divergence from the truth has sometimes only to be continued to approximate to more rational and sober sentiments. Thus, however, it is alleged that miraculous evidence has in our days been afforded in favour of this peculiarity of theological doctrine.

Two cases have been proposed as satisfactory instances of this divine interference.

"A young person of the name of Campbell, occasionally, in certain moments of inspiration, seizes the pen or pencil, and writes like lightning a number of unknown characters or figures, which have been affirmed by some persons to be Persian, by others Chinese, by others Japanese, and by some to be most probably one of the languages of the interior of Africa. But be they what they may, they are declared to be a writing of an unknown tongue, under the immediate influence of the Holy Spirit, and a proof that God is with his people of a truth."

The second case is this:

"At a prayer-meeting in Port Glasgow, at which two gentlemen attended with a view to ascertain the real state of the case, a man named Macdonald prayed; and at length while he prayed the gift of tongues was poured out upon him; and he prayed in an unknown tongue for a quarter of an hour, ending with two words, on which he laid a great stress, '*disco capito*.' One of the gentlemen present, not satisfied with this gift only, said, 'It is written, Pray that ye may interpret,' on which Macdonald prayed again, and was soon answered by this gift also; for he arose, and, with a voice like thunder, cried, 'I have the interpretation; *disco capito*, the shout of a kingdom is in the midst of you.' It appears, however, that the interpretation only extended to the two terminating words on which the man had laid so much emphasis. At the close of the meeting a young female stated to these two gentlemen, that she had received

that evening a most wonderful answer to prayer; for that previously to the meeting being assembled, she had retired with a young friend, and prayed for an increase of faith and holy boldness, and that the shout of a king might be in the midst of them; 'and you see, Sir,' she continued, 'in the interpretation now given, what a wonderful testimony we have received.' This young person, it must be observed, however, was the sister of the man Macdonald who had received the gift; and whom, according to their own account, only a few days before, he had raised from a bed of sickness by an instant command to rise."—P. 7.

This case, taken with all its peculiar features, was so satisfactory to the two gentlemen, that they considered all the miracles of the New Testament to be not more satisfactory than this coincidence of expression: they considered it to be a commanding miraculous testimony which ought to be implicitly received.

Mr. Craig has very successfully shewn the entire absence of all suitable evidence of miraculous interference in these cases. With reference to the writing of Miss Campbell, the declaration of Professor Lee, of Cambridge, to whom a fac-simile had been sent, is given in this pamphlet, that in his judgment 'it contains neither character nor language known in any region under the sun.' There is an important lesson which may be learned from such occurrences, which is very necessary for those who incline to fanaticism, and that is, concerning the use of reason in matters of religion.

ART. VIII.—*The Season of Autumn, as connected with Human Feelings and Changes. A Sermon occasioned by the Death of W. Hazlitt.* By J. Johns.

The Livingness of the Departed. A Sermon on occasion of the Death of Mr. Thomas Mudge, Sen., of Crediton. By J. Johns.

THESE Sermons are both characterized, the first in an eminent degree, by those beauties of thought and style, of sentiment and imagery, which our readers know Mr. Johns to possess. We regret in both an occasional remoteness of allusion, the introduction of which is more allowable in a poem than in a sermon; and an occasional attempt at the coinage of expressive words, which is not expedient in either. But these are foibles on which we are not disposed to dwell

in a writer who lays hold upon our sympathies as Mr. Johns does. And there are, moreover, in harmony with that pervading tone of piety and goodness which is the vitality of a sermon, other qualities of a higher value than those which we have just specified. There is a courage and a pathos in these discourses which we feel to be creditable to the head and heart of the writer. He excels in the delicate, soothing, and useful management of the appropriate topics of a funeral sermon; it is by such hands "that the stones of all our human graves may be piled into a tower whose top shall reach unto heaven" (vide 2nd Sermon, p. 22); and while his character of Mr. Madge, the late patriarch of the Crediton congregation, is a touching portrait of one who 'being dead yet speaketh' by the remembrance of an old age of piety and worth, that of Mr. Hazlitt is the production of a poetical, a patriotic, and a Christian spirit; it is the manly discharge of a debt of justice and gratitude to the memory of one who was out of grace with the world and the church; it is marked by justice, discrimination, and feeling; it is "beautiful and brave."

We regret that we cannot make room for some passages which we had purposed to extract.

GENERAL LITERATURE.

ART IX.—*The Present State of Australia; a Description of the Country, its Advantages and Prospects with reference to Emigration, and a particular Account of the Manners, Customs, and Condition of its Aboriginal Inhabitants.* By Robert Dawson, Esq., late Chief Agent to the Australian Agricultural Company.

THE next thing to the personal enjoyment of the cloudless skies and sunny prospects of a southern climate, is to read of them in such a book as this of Mr. Dawson's, where, without being convicts, we may enjoy in fancy all the charms of that paradise of evil-doers, New South Wales.

The author's pursuits led him repeatedly into the wildest paths of this unfrequented region. The whole country presents the appearance of a vast forest, occasionally broken into glades and vistas of great beauty.

"The hills are every where clothed with wood to their summits, with eternal verdure beneath them, in their natural

state, unaccompanied by brush or under-wood, so that we are often reminded of gentlemen's pleasure grounds seen from a distance."—"I could discern, to a considerable distance, the bendings of the stream, which was marked by a fringe of casurino and mimosa plants. The sun was just receding behind the western ranges, which on that side bounded this comparatively extensive plain. The beautiful effect of its departing rays, as reflected from the opposite hills and broken ranges in the distance, formed a magnificent picture. The stillness of the scene was only interrupted by the chirping of grasshoppers, and the grazing of the horses upon the luxuriant herbage at a short distance from the tent."—Pp. 52, 190. Alone, with the exception of a few attendants, he met the native savages, of whom we have heard so formidable a description; and here we have, perhaps, the most interesting portion of the work, an impartial and picturesque account of the aborigines of the country:

"The natives are a mild and harmless race of savages; and when any mischief has been done by them, the cause has generally arisen, I believe, in bad treatment by their white neighbours. They have usually been treated in distant parts of the colony as if they had been dogs, and shot by convict servants, at a distance from society, for the most trifling causes. The natives complained to me frequently that 'white pellow' shot their relations and friends, and shewed me many orphans whose parents had fallen by the hands of white men near this spot. They pointed out one white man, who they said had killed ten; and the wretch did not deny it, but said he would kill them whenever he could."—"Their painted bodies, white teeth, shock heads of hair; their wild and savage appearance, with the reflection of the fire in a dark night, would have formed a terrific spectacle to any person coming suddenly and unexpectedly upon them. They are, however, one of the best-natured people in the world, and would never hurt a white man if treated with civility and kindness."—Pp. 57, 68.

Most of this gentleman's attention appears to have been given to the observation of the capabilities of the climate and soil of the colony for rearing sheep for the production of wool; and the result, in his opinion, is, that the fleeces of New South Wales might, under good management, compete with the finest productions of Europe.

Our limits will not allow us to do justice, by longer extracts, to this interesting volume, which we recommend to our readers as by much the most full and clear account which has yet appeared of New South Wales, and of the objects to be kept in view by persons proposing to settle there.

ART. X.—*The Correspondence and Diary of Philip Doddridge, D.D.* Edited by J. D. Humphreys, Esq. Vol. IV. Colburn and Bentley. 1830.

OUR extended notices of the three preceding volumes of this work render it unnecessary for us to say more, on the appearance of the present, than that the interest of the Correspondence rises as it becomes more expressive of the stability of the author's friendships, and of the matured excellence of his mind.

ART. XI.—*The First Lesson Book for Sunday-Schools.* Printed for the Sunday-School Society.

A SPELLING-BOOK on the Hamiltonian system! "With double translation"? Not exactly, but pure Hamiltonian. "How so"? You learn to spell by learning to read, and you are strongly advised to learn to read before you learn your letters. A b, ab, and e b, eb, are gone to the shades, and there is to be no such thing as a column of hard words left in the land. It is certain that spelling is a great mystery. Very few people can spell but the printers; and there is no reason to suppose that every embryo printer has had a double portion of hard words before he was breeched. Then at young ladies' schools in the

last generation, how many columns of many-syllabled words were "got by rote" every day! and, as all the world knows, very few of those ladies could spell. Practice and association, it seems, do their work in this as in most other things, and people must learn to spell as they learn to talk, and to walk, and to live, by *trying*, and not by artificial arrangement and verbose instruction. For this reason we recommend the First Lesson Book, where the words, from the very beginning, are grouped into sentences,—“an ox,” “go up,” “do it.” No matter how short, or how slight the connexion; it is found by experience that words so arranged are more attractive and better retained,—that a child can walk better, in short, upon planks than upon stepping-stones. As to the execution, we have only to say, that “*Lay not in bed*” is a rotten plank, and that we doubt the expediency of introducing into a *First Lesson-Book* many abstract and pious injunctions. “Do not go on the ice,” is well enough; but “Keep the laws of God, then peace of mind will be thy lot,” is out of the reach of a child who is travelling through page the ninth. “The fear of the Lord is a spring of life, to keep thee from the snares of the bad.” Who would undertake to explain to the lowest class of a Sunday-school (or of any school) what “a spring of life” is, and how it is to keep them from the “snares of the bad”? We should like to see it done according to the formula on the back of the book, and in pursuance of the recommendation to teachers, to “ascertain if the child understands the meaning of every word he reads:” in the mean time, let a pencil be struck through the words, or let nobody under ten years of age be permitted to read them.

MISCELLANEOUS CORRESPONDENCE.

Inquiry respecting Continental Antitrinitarians.

To the Editor.

SIR,

IN Dr. Toulmin's *Life of Socinus*, pp. 275, 276, I learn that “the posterity” of many of the Socinians who were banished from Poland, “still subsist” in “Silesia, Brandenburg, and Prussia;”

and again, “the remains of this unfortunate community are at this day (1777) dispersed through different countries, particularly in the kingdoms of Prussia, the electorate of Brandenburg, and the United Provinces, where they lie more or less concealed, and hold their religious assemblies in a clandestine manner.” In “Poland” also, Dr. Toulmin asserts, that Socinian churches were in

his day to be found. In the historical introduction prefixed by Dr. Rees to his translation of the Racovian Catechism, I read—"Those (of the Unitarian body expelled from Poland) who obtained a settlement in Prussia and Brandenburg, were permitted to form churches for Unitarian worship, which are yet (1818) in existence, though not in a very flourishing condition."

Being engaged in the composition of a work, for the execution of which I require accurate information of the state of Unitarianism on the Continent, I shall feel exceedingly obliged to any of your readers, who may possess or have the means of obtaining them, for any details serving to illustrate the statements above quoted, or relating to churches or individuals now holding Anti-trinitarian sentiments in any of the continental states. If, at the same time, any of your readers could inform me where I might procure a copy of "*Bock Historia Anti-trinitariorum*," they would render me a service which might perhaps conduce to the furtherance of truth. Communications are respectfully requested to be sent to the Monthly Repository Office, addressed to

PHILOMATH.

Mohammed a Reformer of Christianity.

To the Editor.

SIR,

WHOEVER studies the history of the Christian church from a period soon after the time of *Jesus Christ* to the time of *Mohammed*, will be able to trace the gradual adoption of opinions which do not accord with the doctrines contained in the gospels, nor in the history of the Acts of the Apostles.

Permit me briefly to remind your readers that, prior to the Christian era, the *Oriental philosophy*, inculcating that *two* powers, *one* the Author of *good*, and the *other* the author of *evil*, presided over this world, had become prevalent amongst the most civilized nations.

The *Egyptian philosophy* blended the Oriental philosophy with the *Egyptian theology*.

The *Grecian philosophy*, and the same may be said of the *Roman philosophy*, cannot be termed a distinct system; the theories adopted were very dissimilar. If some of them were not totally without the light of truth, many were more obscure, and others devoid of all that was requisite to afford solace in life, and consolation in death.

The *philosophy amongst the Jews* can-

not easily be defined. It was no longer bounded by the tenets of the writers of the Old Testament, but amalgamated with the various hypotheses that had prevailed amongst the people with whom their predecessors had resided during their captivity.

We may also notice that their increasing numbers induced some to emigrate, and many to voyage to different countries, whence, on their return, they imported a number of tenets and practices unknown to their ancestors.

From the Oriental, the Egyptian, the Grecian, the Roman, and the Jewish philosophers and religionists, had arisen a great diversity of sects.

Differences of opinion arose in some minds from casual impressions, in others from eccentricity of genius, or from aberrations of judgment, and in many instances from having to seek after truth in a labyrinth of hypotheses, from whose intricate mazes human judgment was not easily extricated. On the variety of sectarian opinions it may be remarked, that as each colour may be exhibited in a variety of shades, and as the mixture of colours produces novel appearances, so the opinions of men vary more or less in different societies, and not unfrequently amongst the individuals of each society. In the time of the apostles some were of Paul, and some of Apollos, some of Cephas, and some of Christ.

An enumeration of the sects which originated amongst the Jewish and Heathen converts would engross too large a portion of your column, and the immediate object is to notice that there were those who, either from assuming that they had acquired, or from their professing a desire to acquire, wisdom, were termed *Gnostics*; from the several sources already mentioned, they had derived their opinions and mixed and modelled them as they thought proper. Since the apostles were not for a time unanimous on the conformity of the Gentile converts to the Jewish ritual, until Peter, by a dream or vision, became convinced that God is no respecter of persons, but that he who doeth righteousness is righteous, we may readily conceive that the Gnostic sectarians, become professors of Christianity, did not totally discard their former opinions and prejudices, but anxiously sought for analogies and similitudes between their former sentiments and the tenets of their new religion. The numerous names by which the sectarians were distinguished rarely convey accurate information of their respective sentiments; for, as Dr. Mosheim ob-

serves, "One sect derived its name from the place where it originated, another from its Founder, and another again from some particular tenet or leading principle."

Some similar remarks may be made relative to those who are denominated the FATHERS in the Christian church, but the present object is to fix the attention of your readers to the *dogma* held by some of the *Gnostics*, and rejected by *Mohammed*, as contrary to divine truth.

Let those who think unfavourably of Mohammed, say by what charm the descendants of the Chaldeans, the Persians, the Egyptians, and the Indians, were induced to embrace the faith preached by the Arabian prophet. If it be admitted that under every system of religion, and by every sect, a great First Cause, a Supreme Divine Power, was acknowledged by the wisest individuals, how came it to pass that such vast numbers desisted from paying religious reverence to any created object? How came it to pass that the *Sabeans* ceased to pay subordinate worship to the *starry host*, the *Persians* to the sun, the *Egyptians* to their animals, &c., and the *Indians* to the several objects of their superstitious veneration, and that, with a few exceptions in each case, all may be said to concur in the exclamation, *GOD IS ONE, and Mohammed is the Prophet of GOD!*

No true Mohammedan admits that there are two equal powers, *one* the author of *good*, and the *other* the author of *evil*. *No true Mohammedan* admits that matter is eternal, and the only cause of sin. *No true Mohammedan* admits that this world was created by two powers inferior to the Supreme Power. *No true Mohammedan* admits that the *Demiurgus*, or *Creator of this world*, was distinct from the DIVINE CREATOR of the *universe*; and although true Mohammedans object to some of the opinions of the Jewish Doctors respecting the Divine attributes and government, and consider the divine doctrine of JESUS CHRIST to have been mutilated, and its glory shrouded, by the intervention of the errors of Gnosticism and other human conceits, yet all true Mohammedans believe the GOD of the *Jews*, the GOD of the *Christians*, the GOD of the *Mohammedans*, and the *Supreme Divine Power* which the wisest and best of the Heathens acknowledged, to be *ONE* and the *same eternal source of WISDOM, GOODNESS, and MERCY.**

A CHRISTIAN MOSLEM.

* I am aware that Dr. Mosheim un-

Turkish Piety and Morality.

To the Editor.

SIR,

Nov. 16, 1830.

I AM sure there is not one of your readers who would not wish that he could feel justified by facts in thinking as favourably of the Turkish character as your correspondent Mr. Yates. As "friends of humanity and civilization," they would rejoice to be convinced that they have formed a harsher opinion than they are justified in entertaining: and the prominent place they hold among the advocates of every thing that is liberal will acquit them from all suspicion of any sentiment like religious bigotry and intolerance influencing their judgment on this subject. I fear, however, that the witnesses "most intelligent and competent" are too numerous to allow charity herself to speak in terms of approbation of the "charitable disposition," (in the sense in which Christians are wont to use the expression,) or the "religious sincerity," of the Turks.

The following extracts are from the Travels of R. R. Madden, Esq., in Turkey, Syria, and Egypt, &c., from 1823 to

sparingly brands Mohammed as an impostor or a fanatic. There is no ground for the supposition that Mohammed anticipated the ultimate result of his ministry: an impostor must have had some sinister end in view. That Mohammed was actuated by a conscientious desire to propagate what he believed to be true relative to the *Unity of God*, ought not without proof to be denied. The term fanatic is a commonly opprobrious term bestowed on persons ardently zealous in the support of a doctrine not coinciding with our own. I shall, however, subjoin an extract from that learned and valuable writer, which your readers will consider an intentional commendation. Dr. Mosheim, speaking of the opinion relative to the government of the universe by two powers, *one* the author of *good*, the *other* the author of *evil*, says, "This doctrine was received throughout a considerable part of *Asia* and *Africa*, especially amongst the *Chaldeans*, *Assyrians*, *Syrians*, and *Egyptians*, though with different modifications, and had even infected the Jews themselves. The Arabians at that time, and even afterwards, were more remarkable for strength and courage than for genius and sagacity, nor do they seem, according to their own confession, to have acquired any great reputation for wisdom and philosophy before the time of Mahomet."—E. Hist. Vol. I. p. 84.

1828, and exhibit his opinion of the Turkish character after a five years' residence in these countries, and perhaps a freer intercourse with the inhabitants than can possibly fall to the lot of travellers who are not of the medical profession. His work gives sufficient evidence of intelligence and competency for the task of an observer on the opinions and manners of men, as well as of freedom from that intolerance which marks the religious bigot, and from that irascibility and impatience which often lead travellers to hasty and ungenerous conclusions.

Description of a Turkish Man of Quality.

"His inherent hostility to Christianity is the first principle of his law, and the perfidy it is supposed to enjoin is the most prominent feature of his character: I say supposed to enjoin, for though the Koran inculcates *passim*, the extermination of Christians in open warfare, it nowhere approves of the treachery and inhumanity of which the priesthood make a merit. But persecution is one of the amiable weaknesses of all theologians; and it would be a folly to stigmatize the church of Christ with the charge of intolerance, because Calvin, moderate as he was, pursued a theological opponent even unto death. The most striking qualities of the Moslem are his profound ignorance, his insuperable arrogance, his habitual indolence, and the perfidy which directs his policy in the divan, and regulates his ferocity in the field. The defects in his character are those of the nation; they are the growth of sudden greatness—the intoxication of prosperity enjoyed without reason or restraint. Before conquest and plunder had exalted the nation on the ruin of other realms, the Turk was brave in the field, faithful to his friend, and generous to his foe. It was then unusual to commend the cup of poison with a smile, and to beckon to the murderer with the oath of friendship on his lips: but treachery is now an accomplishment in Turkey; and I have seen so much of it for some time past, that if my soul were not in some sort attuned to horrors, I should wish myself in Christendom with no other excitement than the simple murders of a Sunday newspaper."—Pp. 18, 19.

Turkish Character.

"As to their moral qualities I cannot go to the length of Thornton's commendation, nor of De Tott's abuse. In my medical relations with them, I had much to admire and a great deal to condemn.

I found them charitable to the poor, attentive to the sick, and kind to their domestics: but I also found them treacherous to their enemies, and thankless to their benefactors. Eight cases of poisoning have fallen under my observation already; five of these victims I attended, and in every case the fatal dose did its deadly business within eight and forty hours: but in most instances within twelve. Of all things in Turkey human life is of the least value; and of all the roads to honour and ambition, murder is deemed the most secure. I sat beside a Candiate Turk at dinner, who boasted of having killed eleven men in cold blood; and the society of this assassin was courted by the cousin of the *Reis Effendi*, at whose house I met him, because he was a 'man of courage.'—Vol. I. pp. 29, 30.

Turkish Catechism and Morality.

"What morals may be expected in a people who have such a catechism for children as the following passages are extracted from, is sufficiently obvious:

"Q. How must religion be promoted?

"A. By fighting against all who oppose the Koran till the infidels are cut off from the earth.

"Q. How do you serve your Sultan?

"A. By making my head his footstool; by living and dying at his pleasure."

"There are many parts appertaining to the Unity of God in this same catechism worthy of a better religion. But unfortunately, however excellent some of their doctrines may be, they have but little influence over their dreadful vices. I doubt if the cities which once stood on the shores of the Dead Sea, could even afford a parallel to the infamy openly avowed and practised in the Turkish metropolis."—P. 73.

Turkish Treatment of Christians.

"In every corner of the city, a pack of hungry dogs are suffered to prowl, for the diversion they afford in worrying all Frank passengers; and nothing can exceed the amusement of the Turks when they behold a Christian mangled by these ferocious animals. I can safely say I have never once passed through the *bazaars* without having the dogs set on me by the men; without having stones pelted at me by the boys; or being spit upon by the women, and cursed as an Infidel and a Caffre by all.

"I was very near having a sword put through me for chastising a little rascal who flung a stone at my head; and on

another occasion for only looking indignant at a fat lady who spat upon me."—P. 95.

"At noon on our return we had an adventure of rather a perilous description, and one which illustrates the brutality of the people towards Christians, however unoffending.

"We approached the door of a *Khan*, built by Hassan Pacha, to request permission to repose for half an hour; and our request was answered by opening the door of the court yard, and letting out a pack of savage dogs on us: in a moment we had from twenty to five and twenty famished mongrels springing at our throats; our boots luckily preserved our feet and legs, but our apparel was soon in flitters. My friend, the consul, unfortunately ran, and had the worst of the attack; I defended myself as well as I could—sometimes, like the heroes of Homer, pelting with stones; sometimes, more *unclassically*, kicking right and left, and ultimately exhibiting pocket pistols, on which the Turks (who had been all this time enjoying our distress) made a threatening signal to me to refrain from firing.

"I entreated them repeatedly to call off the dogs; but the more I entreated the more they were amused; and one fellow said 'it was fitting that one dog should fatten on another.' Had we been mangled before them, joint by joint, they would have esteemed it a good joke; and I really at one time thought we were likely to afford them that amusement. Luckily for us, a young man at last interfered, and prevailed on his inhuman companions, many of whom were advanced in years, to take off our ferocious assailants; and I assure you it was high time, for we were completely worried. I endeavoured to get these ruffians punished; but, as usual, the complaint of a Christian was laughed at."—Pp. 141, 142.

Religious Sincerity of the Turks.

"The caravan consisted chiefly of pilgrims going to the Holy City, and a vast number of public women, professed *Alme*; of these I counted fourteen, and I did not see them all. I thought their licentious dances and conversation likely to inspire a very different sort of devotion from that which pious pilgrims ought to feel; but religion is made the pander of the vilest passions in Turkey; and the devotee who abandons his wife and family, and hazards his existence to visit the shrine of his prophet, scruples not

to make a prostitute the companion of his pilgrimage."—Vol. II. p. 211.

Many other passages occur in the two volumes, difficult to be extracted, which shew it to be Mr. Madden's opinion, that what he says of the Turkish religious character at Cairo, may be considered as applicable to the Turks generally: "The name of the Prophet is in every man's mouth, and the fear of God in few men's hearts."—Vol. I. p. 307.

That Mr. Madden was not blind to the moral or religious excellence of the Turks, because it happened to be connected with the religion of an impostor, is shewn by the following brief sketch of the Arab character, and which has evidently left a different impression on his mind:

"The more I see of the Arabs, the more I am convinced they are naturally the kindest-hearted people in the world. Travellers generally, who pass hastily through the country, have reason, I grant, to complain of their rapacity; but travellers, I believe, in every country, not excepting England, are doomed to be the victims of extortion. The misery of the Arabs, too, often obliges them to be knaves; but their dishonesty is on so small a scale, that I never knew an Arab servant extend a larceny beyond the theft of a few piastres, or the appropriation of his master's tobacco to his own use. The freedom they take with a traveller's provisions they account not theft, for they are liberal of their own; it is only the abuse of hospitality which renders an Arab '*profusus sui, appetens alieni*.'"—Vol. I. p. 369.

With regard to the "steady patriotism" of the Turks, even their warmest advocates can, I presume, say but little when they reflect upon the disastrous issue of their late war with Russia. If it formed a feature in their character when Tournefort wrote, they gave no evidence of its existence when the armies of Nicolas were overrunning their territories.

S.

On the Rev. F Knowles's Appeal to the English Unitarians on the Marriage Question

To the Editor.

SIR, Warrington, Oct. 6, 1830.

THIS is an admirable little tract, and demands the serious attention of the Unitarian public. It is evidently written with a pure conscience, and a heart that would dread to offend a righteous God

by complying with what the author considers an idolatrous ceremony. Although it may contain some eccentric passages, and occasionally an untenable proposition, yet what consistent Unitarian can gainsay the remarks on protesting, (a custom far better neglected than observed,) or reply to the following extract from the preface? "It is a fact that Unitarians condemn the marriage service as being 'repugnant to their religious principles.' It is equally true that with such an impression of its character they conform to it; and, moreover, think themselves justifiable in so doing. They maintain, then, by their conduct this proposition—that it is right to do that which they believe at the same time to be opposed to their consciences. They maintain, or endeavour to maintain, it by their words whenever they can be induced to enter into discussion on the subject. But this is very rarely the case; for though the friends of inquiry on every other topic, yet on this, inquiry, generally speaking, is their aversion; and their only solicitude seems to be to seek their justification in silence. Well if they can find it there; or, in its absence, that lowly spirit of penitence which best becomes the erring children of God."

Should it be maintained that the greater part of Unitarians do not violate their consciences by complying with the marriage ceremony, the writer justly argues that no such view can be taken of the subject, if we are to judge by their petitions and their complaints in the public newspapers and magazines; and that consequently it becomes them to reflect whether they will any longer obey man rather than God. "There is also another strong confirmation of what has been advanced, (says this persevering and consistent advocate of the truth,) in the fact, that others who are not Unitarians have admitted the reasonableness of their objections, and the justice of their prayer. The Edinburgh Review for March 1821, says, that 'the establishment compels a Unitarian to abjure his faith before it will allow him to marry.' 'Unitarians are required at present,' affirmed the Bishop of Worcester, 'to join in a service that implies a confession of faith repugnant to their conscientious feelings and opinions.' 'Really this is a most cruel requisition,' observed Lord Holland: 'the Unitarian is to be required to repeat words to which it is avowed the priest annexes one meaning and he another. It is quite clear that such matters must be painful

and revolting.' 'A Unitarian is obliged,' said Dr. Lushington, 'to utter with his mouth at the altar that which he abhors in his heart' Such are the testimonies of persons standing high in character and station, and disinterested in the question. They ought to carry weight with them, and I think they must to every Unitarian that will reflect."

I hope that some of your readers will more fully notice this work, as discussion must be of service to the cause of truth and holiness.

L. G.

Sir Walter Scott's Letters on Demonology and Witchcraft.

To the Editor.

SIR,

IN reading the Letters of Sir Walter Scott, on Demonology and Witchcraft, while I have been delighted with the abundance of interesting matter which he has brought together, and generally edified by the reasonable notions of religion which that author seems to entertain, I have been much surprised at the misapplication made of one passage of Scripture, common, indeed, in the mouths of the reputedly orthodox, and which furnishes convincing evidence of the occasional unfaithfulness of our common version. This passage is Jer. xvii. 9, and the manner in which it is introduced by our author is this: "The melancholy truth 'that the human heart is deceitful above all things and desperately wicked,' is by nothing proved so strongly as by the imperfect sense displayed by children of the sanctity of moral truth." I cannot but regret that our author should have had the authority of the version read in all the churches in favour of so unworthy and unchristian a sentiment. It is scarcely to be supposed that he can be acquainted with the admission of the Lexicographer Parkhurst, the bias of whose creed was in the opposite direction. "The English translation *desperately wicked*, seems very improper. I do not find that the word ever denotes *wickedness* at all." The rendering of Dr. Blayney is, "The heart is wily above all things; it is even past hope." I doubt, however, whether he has correctly represented the meaning of the sacred writer, and am disposed to follow a manuscript numbered 173, by Kennicott, corroborated by the ancient Syriac Version, in omitting the conjunction *and* in the passage, so that the translation may be, "Man himself is

deceitful in heart above all, who shall know him"? A sense which I apprehend harmonizes the passage with its connexion, with the doctrine of Scripture, and with our experience of human nature. This cannot, I think, be affirmed of the Common Version, besides that in an important particular it is wholly unsupported by the original language.

M.

Extract from Orme's Life of Owen.

To the Editor.

SIR,

THE following passage in Orme's Life of Owen, a book well known among the Independents, might be of service to the writer, and perhaps to some readers, of a recent article in the Eclectic Review. It may not be without its use to readers of the Repository.

"There are many fine and important passages in this work,* an attention to which on the part of believers would lead to much self-examination, watchfulness, and humility. The remains of inbred corruption sufficiently account for the little progress which is too generally made in the Christian profession, for the fearful misconduct and falls to which men who have named the name of Christ are frequently left; for the want of that solid peace and enjoyment of which believers often complain; and for that conformity to the world, in its pleasures and vanities, which distinguish many, who would be offended if their Christian character were called in question. These things were matter of complaint and lamentation in the days of Owen, and are no less so now. It is true, we have a larger portion of public zeal, and of bustling activity, in promoting the interests of religion. This is well, ought to be encouraged—and must be matter of thankfulness to every sincere Christian. But the deceitfulness of sin may operate as effectually, though less obviously, in many whose 'zeal for the Lord of Hosts' may appear very prominent, as in times when such exertions were not made. It is much easier to subscribe money to religious societies, to make speeches at public meetings, to unite in plans of associated usefulness, than to sit in judgment over our hearts, or to correct the aberrations of conduct, spirit, and disposition. There may be much public professional warmth, and great inward private decay. There may, in short, be a merging of individual, se-

cret religion, in the bustle and crowd of general profession and public life. These things are suggested, not for the purpose of discouraging public exertion and association for the diffusion of truth, but for the purpose of leading men to consider that, in our circumstances, genuine Christianity is not necessary to do many things which are now the objects of general approbation; and that such things, however excellent in themselves, are but poor substitutes for a life of holy obedience and converse with ourselves and with heaven. Such as engage in these objects would do well to read Owen on Indwelling-Sin."—Pp. 315, 316.

—

Chalmers and Channing.

To the Editor.

SIR,

THE following remarks on these two celebrated men occur in a note at the end of "Dialogues on Natural and Revealed Religion, by the Rev. Robert Morehead, D. D., F. R. S. E., one of the ministers of St. Paul's Chapel, York Place, Edinburgh." (Dr. Morehead's book throughout breathes a mild, humble, and amiable spirit, which, if it be an effect of his belonging to an episcopal but *unestablished* church, must almost make the reader wish that the Doctor's brethren, in this country, could have the benefit of a similar position.)

After speaking of Dr. Chalmers, the author goes on to say,

"There is only, I think, one other individual in the present day, whose high qualifications entitle him to any thing of a similar influence, and he is the inhabitant of another division of the globe, and the preacher, too, of a very different and even defective form of Christianity. I mean Dr. Channing. Yet, though with theological dogmas as distinct and diverging as they are themselves separated by their geographical position, and with many discrepancies, too, in the features of their mind and genius, I cannot but think that these remarkable men come nearer each other in their points of resemblance and union, than they are remote in their dissimilarities and division. They breathe the same spirit of an overflowing zeal that the reign of the gospel may advance over the world, and the same deep conviction that, on the progress of 'that kingdom which is to come,' all the most glorious and spiritual triumphs of the human soul must depend. In the best sense of the Apostle, they are, therefore, 'of one mind'—

* Owen on Indwelling-Sin.

while they will be classed, in the mere technical map of theology, as being decidedly antipodes. The high Calvinism of the one, or the dogged Unitarianism of the other, will be accounted, however, by the mind which surrenders itself to the purer influences issuing from these 'master-spirits of this age,' rather as their excrescences than their energies, as 'the nodosities of the oak rather than

its strength,' as the spots which somewhat obstruct their light and heat, more than the living fountain from which they flow. That fountain, indeed, 'who shall tell?' Yet its streams can never be mistaken when they mingle, amidst all their diversities, in the same grand and united channel of *the love of God and the love of man!*"

*

OBITUARY.

MISS MARY ROE.

1830. Oct. 23, at *Norwich*, after a long and painful illness, MARY, elder daughter of Mrs. John ROE. The death of one so young and so promising is one of those dispensations which speak to every heart, more particularly to the young, and tell us by what uncertain ties our strongest affections here are bound. She had looked forward to life with "golden hopes" and bright anticipations, but at the age of twenty-one they were shrouded in the grave! So has it pleased a mysterious but all-wise Providence, and the reason for recording her humble name in these pages, is the hope that should the eye of the young glance for a moment on this frail memento, penned by the hand of affection, it may prove an incitement to them to be "ready also." Worn by sickness and pain, she at length longed to be released from her earthly sufferings, and it pleased her heavenly Father that her release should be met by her with as bright an intellect and as ardent a hope as ever she had enjoyed in her days of health; the terror, the "sting of death" appeared to be taken away; and leaving those she loved, to use her own expression, "she wished only to die!" Thus were the anxieties of those who most tenderly suffer this bereavement alleviated, and her parent, under this consoling feeling, has "not to earth resigned her, but to God," in humble hope of a happy re-union, when the shades of this life are lost in the brightness of immortality!

WILLIAM FILLINGHAM.

Nov. 13, after a long illness, borne with Christian patience and fortitude, at his father's house, aged 15 years, WILLIAM, son of the Rev. William FILLINGHAM, of Congleton. He was interred on the 16th, when an impressive ad-

dress was delivered to the friends of the deceased by the Rev. T. M. Williams, of Macclesfield (late of the Presbyterian College, Carmarthen). To a bereaved and sorrowing parent it affords no small joy to reflect that during the short space of human life allotted to his son, were evinced those traits of piety and virtue which held out a fair promise of usefulness and respectability of character. And that these pleasing expectations should have been thus blighted by death, he conceives to be among those events which puzzle human reason satisfactorily to account for, but which will hereafter be found, like every other part of the divine proceeding, of all possible courses the wisest and the best.

MRS. ELIZABETH GILES.

Nov. 28, at *Woodbridge*, much respected, after a long affliction, borne with the most patient resignation to the Divine will, ELIZABETH, the wife of Mr. Thomas GILES.

Obituary of Rev. J. M. Beynon; additional particulars by Dr. Rees.

To the Editor.

SIR,

I HAVE read with great interest the memoir, inserted in your last number, of my late excellent and esteemed friend, the Rev. J. M. Beynon, of Yarmouth. In what the writer of that affectionate testimony to his memory has stated, as to his deep and unaffected piety as a Christian minister, the impressive earnestness of his manner as a preacher, and the amiable and exemplary virtues which, in all the intercourse of social and domestic life, he uniformly displayed, I fully and cordially concur.

The biographer seems not, however, to be fully informed as to the circum-

stances of Mr. Beynon's early history, and I solicit your permission to mention a few additional facts, which I am able to supply from authentic sources. Mr. Beynon received the principal part of his introductory classical education under the able instruction of the Rev. Solomon Harris, of Swansea, a man no less distinguished by his sound classical attainments, and his extensive and varied erudition, as a scholar and a divine, than by the high and amiable excellences of his private life. During a part of the time he was at this school my late venerated father was his associate. In 1766, Mr. Beynon quitted the Grammar School, and was admitted a student at the Presbyterian Academy, Carmarthen, of which the Rev. Samuel Thomas, and the Rev. Dr. Jenkins, both eminent for their learning and abilities, were at that time the tutors. Here he became again the fellow-student of my father, who, being two years his senior in years, had preceded him to college. In this institution Mr. Beynon passed through the regular course of four years, at the termination of which, in 1769, being desirous of reaping the further advantages promised by an English Academy, he was admitted a student at Warrington. Here he remained three years, studying with exemplary diligence the higher branches of the course under Dr. Aikin and Dr. Enfield.

Of Mr. Beynon's contemporaries at the Carmarthen Academy few have been spared to reach so advanced an age. My honoured father preceded him to the grave six-and-twenty years. Those who now remain are, I believe, the Rev. Benjamin Evans, of Stockton-upon-Tees, the Rev. Theophilus Edwards, of Taunton, and the Rev. John Davies, of London, men venerable alike for their years and their characters. To this brief list I am not certain whether I may not add the Rev. Rowland Smith, of Clare, in Suffolk.

At the time Mr. Beynon was a student at the Carmarthen Academy it was customary to educate at that institution, upon a separate foundation, a certain number of young men for the ministry in the Church of England. Two of his contemporaries of this class are now living, sustaining a high rank in their profession—the Rev. Mr. Archdeacon Beynon, of Carmarthen, and the Rev. Mr. Jones, Vicar of Lewisham, Kent.

The biographer has mentioned one of Mr. Beynon's contemporaries at Warrington, the Rev. Philip Taylor, of Dublin. (*Clarum et venerabile nomen.*) In looking over the list of the Warrington students at that period, I do not find myself able to add more than one name, and that is Mr. Robert Alderson, whose father was for many years the respected minister of the Presbyterian congregation at Lowestoff. Mr. Robert Alderson was educated at Warrington on the foundation of the London Presbyterian Fund. After quitting the Academy he officiated at Filby, where, if I remember correctly, Mrs. Alderson, who was the daughter of Mr. Samuel Hurry, of Yarmouth, was many years ago buried. He was also for several years the colleague of my much-esteemed and greatly-lamented friend, Mr. George Cadogan Morgan, as joint minister of the Octagon Unitarian Chapel, Norwich. Mr. Alderson afterwards quitted the ministry, the Unitarians, and the Dissenters, embraced the profession of a barrister, became a leading counsel on the Norwich circuit, and obtained the honourable appointments of Recorder of Ipswich, and Steward of Norwich. His son has also distinguished himself in the same profession, and has recently been elevated to the Bench as one of the new Judges.

THOMAS REES.

*Lark-hall Lane, Clapham,
December 13, 1830.*

INTELLIGENCE.

Hinckley Fellowship Fund.

ON Sunday, the 21st of November, a public meeting of the friends of the Unitarian cause was held at the Great Meeting at Hinckley, Leicestershire, for the purpose of establishing a society there,

to be designated the "Hinckley Great Meeting Fellowship Fund." At the close of the afternoon service, Mr. James Eaglesfield having taken the Chair, the Rev. G. Skey proceeded to give an account of the plan and objects of the institution about to be formed, and read

an extract from the annual report of the Sheffield Fellowship Fund, (inserted in the Monthly Repository, November, 1828,) detailing an account of the rise and progress of these useful institutions, under their lamented founder, the late Dr. Thomson, of Leeds.

The rules of the Society were read over and adopted, and a President, Committee, and officers were chosen for the ensuing year; and besides the monthly meetings of the Committee, Christmas-day was fixed upon for the general meeting of the Society. As no periodical publications are added to the Chapel Library, it was resolved (in imitation of other societies mentioned in the above report) to circulate the Repository, Reformer, and other publications of the same nature, amongst those individuals of the Fellowship Fund who have not hitherto had an opportunity of reading them. Between thirty and forty persons immediately entered their names as subscribers; and we trust that much good will arise in the town and neighbourhood from this institution, as soon as its plans are carried into operation.

A Statement of Facts, Arguments, and Proceedings, in Opposition to a certain Clause in the Birmingham Free Grammar School Bill, 1830: with an Appendix of Documents.

In the year 1552, a Free Grammar School was founded in Birmingham, by King Edward VI., and endowed from the lands of a guild, then lately dissolved. From the great increase, in more recent time, of the population of Birmingham, a considerable portion of these lands has been built upon; and the income of the school, originally only 20*l.* per annum, has gradually advanced to upwards of 3000*l.*; will soon be 10,000*l.*; and at no very distant period, should the town continue to prosper, may be of double that amount. The school thus possesses ample means of affording every benefit of education to the children of all classes of the inhabitants; and all are deeply interested in the wise administration of its funds.

King Edward, by his Charter, "willed and ordained that there should be twenty men, of the more *discreet and more trusty* inhabitants of the town, parish, or manor of Birmingham, who should be governors of the possessions, revenues, and goods of the said school;" and that, on the death or the removal of any of the governors, the remaining governors

should choose his successor; no other qualification being required than what is above stated.

The population of Birmingham, like that of all other great towns, is composed of persons of various religious denominations. It is generally supposed, that, at present, not more than one half of the inhabitants are members of the Church of England. Something similar has probably been the case, ever since the passing of the Act of Uniformity. It might not unreasonably be expected, therefore, that some of the governors of a school, founded for the common benefit of all the inhabitants, should be chosen from among the Dissenters. At no very remote period, a majority of them were of that description; but for many years past, there has not been a single Dissenter among them: though it cannot, for one moment, be contended, that there have not been, at all times, among the Dissenters, persons in every respect well qualified for such an office. The Dissenters made no complaint; but hoped that the progress of better feelings would eventually relieve them from this unmerited proscription.

It may, perhaps, be not improper to mention, that many persons, of some influence in the town, had long been anxiously endeavouring to prevent or to assuage all bitterness of party spirit; and to foster, among people of all religious persuasions, sentiments of mutual kindness and good-will, so conformable to the precepts of the gospel; so conducive to the peace and comfort of individuals; and so favourable to the prosperity of a great commercial and manufacturing community. Their exertions appeared to have been productive of the desired effect; and, on public occasions, the increased prevalence of liberal feelings and principles, in all sects and parties, had, for some years past, formed a common topic of mutual congratulation.

The governors of the Free School, in the year 1824, judged it expedient to apply to the Court of Chancery, and subsequently to Parliament, for some enlargement of their powers; with a view, it was presumed, of rendering their large income more extensively useful. Some dissatisfaction was occasioned in the town, by the proposed improvements never having been communicated to the inhabitants at large—the parties beneficially interested in the vast income, of which the governors are only the trustees: but there was no public expression of such a feeling; and the governors were left at perfect liberty to form and mature

their plans, entirely at their own discretion.

It was not, therefore, without the greatest surprise, that when the governors were on the point of bringing their proposed bill before Parliament, the Dissenters accidentally discovered that it contained a clause, directing that no person should be elected a governor, who is not a Member of the Established Church of England.

The Dissenters were, at first, perfectly unable to persuade themselves that such a clause could form a part of the bill; so utterly at variance was it with the spirit of the times, and, as they had fondly hoped, with the spirit of the town. There seemed, likewise, no motive for its introduction. The governors already possessed the power of exclusion: they had long exercised it, to the entire exclusion of Dissenters: and they might continue to exercise it, or forbear to exercise it, as, in their judgment, the interests of the school might, at any time, require. Why deprive themselves and their successors of a discretion, allowed by the Charter? But, above all, why, under present circumstances, stigmatize a large proportion of their fellow-townsmen, with whom they were associating on terms of the greatest apparent cordiality, by declaring them for ever unworthy of a most important trust,—one which their ancestors had often held, and never abused, and in the due discharge of which they were equally interested with all the rest of the inhabitants?

It was soon, however, ascertained, that a clause, to the effect above stated, did actually form one of the enactments of the proposed bill. And the indignation which the intelligence excited among the Dissenters, was heightened by the discovery, that its insertion was no hasty resolution of the governors; that the proceedings, of which it formed a part, had been before the Court of Chancery for several years; and, so far as the jurisdiction of that Court extended, had been finally settled some months before; while, during the whole period of the proceedings, a circumstance, in which they were so materially concerned, had been *studiously concealed* from the parties, whose privileges, interests, and even character, it was intended to affect.

A Committee of the Dissenters immediately presented a strong remonstrance to the governors, against the introduction of such a clause. The governors replied, that *the clause had received the sanction of the Court of Chancery, and that they were no longer competent to with-*

draw it. They did not, however, express any regret at this inability. The Dissenters were, at the same time, informed, that a printed copy of the proposed bill, *which none of them had yet seen*, would be sent to Birmingham the next day; *but they were not informed, of what they afterwards found to be the fact, that the bill had already been read a first time in the House of Lords, and was to be read A SECOND TIME, the very day that copy would arrive in Birmingham.*

The next step for the Dissenters to take, was to petition the House of Lords to be heard by counsel against the bill. Measures were taken to convene, as soon as possible, a general meeting of Dissenters for that purpose. A petition was then agreed upon; and such was the excitement which the conduct of the governors of the Free School had produced, that it received between SIX AND SEVEN THOUSAND signatures in the course of forty-eight hours.

The Dissenters had already sent a deputation to London, to take such measures in their behalf as the urgency of the business might require. A short statement of their case was drawn up, and submitted to several of the more influential members of both Houses of Parliament. The Deputies had the great satisfaction of finding that all the parties, with whom they had interviews, appeared to entertain the same opinion of the conduct of the governors of the Free School, with themselves. Several at once expressed their full conviction that the clause, to which the Dissenters objected, would never receive the sanction of the Legislature. Every step, indeed, which the deputation took, furnished them with additional evidence, that bigotry and intolerance would receive no encouragement from the higher authorities of the State; and that this attempt of a few individuals to re-establish, in their little jurisdiction, those disabilities, from which all classes of Dissenters had been so lately relieved by the repeal of the Corporation and Test Acts, would meet with almost universal reprobation.

From the very first, therefore, they felt quite at ease with regard to the final issue of the business: and they were not at all surprised when a distinguished nobleman, from whom, immediately on their arrival in town, they had received the most gratifying assurances of assistance, informed them that he understood the governors, without any further opposition, would themselves withdraw the clause. The deputies, however, still thought it expedient that the petition of

the General Body of Dissenters of Birmingham should be presented. This was done, in the most able and gratifying manner, by Lord Calthorpe. The reception it met with from the House of Lords, was more favourable to the petitioners than could possibly have been anticipated. *Not a single peer came forward to defend the clause objected to.* The short discussion which took place between the Lord Chancellor and the Earl of Eldon, only respected the proper course for the governors to pursue, in order to expunge it from their bill. The next day they entered into a formal agreement to take the measures, for this purpose, which had been recommended. They accordingly presented an humble petition to the Lord Chancellor, in his Court of Chancery, for permission to amend the bill, and THE CLAUSE IS NOW ERASED.

Thus this extraordinary attempt of the governors of the Free School, to abridge the civil franchises of the Dissenters of Birmingham; to brand them as persons for ever unworthy of a most honourable and important trust; and to revive against so large a portion of their fellow-townsmen the odious spirit of religious persecution, met with a signal and merited defeat.

The Committee of Dissenters have ordered this narrative, and the papers that accompany it, to be printed and circulated, that their brethren, in all parts of the kingdom, may be informed of what has taken place in Birmingham, and, should it unfortunately prove necessary, be encouraged to resist similar aggressions.

APPENDIX OF DOCUMENTS.

[Some of these being of minor importance, or implied in other parts of the statement, are omitted here.]

Case of the Dissenters and others, in opposition to a Clause in the Birmingham Free Grammar School Bill.

"In the year 1552, King Edward the Sixth granted Letters Patent for the establishment of the Free Grammar School in Birmingham, and 'willed and ordained that for the future there should be twenty men of the more discreet and more trusty inhabitants of the town and parish of Birmingham, or of the manor of Birmingham, who should be governors of the possessions, revenues, and goods of the said school;' but the Charter does not prescribe any other limitation of the persons from among whom

the Governors are to be successively elected.

"The present governors of the school, nevertheless, have submitted to Parliament a bill, which has been already read a second time in the House of Lords, and is to go before a committee of that House on Friday next, the 28th May instant, which contains a clause (pp. 39, 46) directing 'that no person shall be elected a governor who is not a member of the Established Church of England.'

"To this clause the Dissenters from the Established Church, and others* who reside within the town, parish, and manor of Birmingham object, that it is not in accordance with either the letter or the spirit of the Royal Founder's Charter, but in effect contravenes both. They further allege, that the proposed restriction does great injustice to a large and important portion of the inhabitants of Birmingham, by declaring them ineligible to an office which, until within a recent period, some of their ancestors held, and uniformly administered with strict impartiality.

"And above all, that this PRIVATE bill, in fact, involves a great PUBLIC principle; since it proposes to re-establish, so far as the corporation of the Birmingham Free School is concerned, those disabilities from which Dissenters from the Church of England have been relieved by the repeal of the Corporation and Test Acts.

"As the school was founded for the common benefit of the town, parish, and manor of Birmingham, without exception, it is submitted that eligibility to the situation of governors should continue to be the privilege of all; the rather, since the harmony and good will of the town and neighbourhood are disturbed by the introduction of the proposed enactment; and would be yet more seriously injured by its becoming a law.

"For these reasons the Dissenters resident in Birmingham respectfully hope that their case will be fully considered by the British Legislature, whose wise and just and salutary measures during the last two sessions of Parliament, in

* This was added purposely with the view of including both those who, although they do not come under the *technical* description of *Dissenters* or *Protestant Dissenters*, were yet aggrieved by the clause in question, and those (not a small body) members of the Established Church who cordially sympathized with their Dissenting neighbours and fellow-townsmen.

behalf of Dissidents from the Established Church, will be *locally* frustrated if the bill in its present form should be passed into a law.

"A petition is in the course of signature by the **DISSENTERS** of Birmingham, to be heard by counsel against the **BILL**, and will be immediately presented.

"Birmingham, May 20, 1830."

Extracts from Resolutions of a General Meeting of Dissenters, &c., May 24, 1830, convened by public Advertisement in the Birmingham Newspapers.

RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY,

"1. That this meeting has heard, with regret and indignation, of the attempt made by the governors of the Free Grammar School, in this town, to deprive those inhabitants who are not members of the Established Church, of their eligibility to the office of governor of the said school.

"2. That the proscription thus attempted to be established is altogether unauthorized by the Charter of the Royal Founder of the school, Edward the Sixth, which merely directs that the governors shall be of the more discreet and more trusty inhabitants of the town, parish, or manor of Birmingham.

"3. That believing the contemplated system of exclusion, if accomplished, will attach a most unmerited stigma to those who, on principle, are dissentient from the Church of England, and that its natural tendency will be to revive divisions and to perpetuate jealousies, which it has been the wise and beneficent policy of the Legislature to heal and extinguish, this meeting feels greatly indebted to those gentlemen who have been the means of bringing the subject before their fellow-townsmen, and approves and confirms the measures which, as a provisional committee, they have adopted to frustrate the object proposed by the governors.

"4. That petitions be immediately presented to both Houses of Parliament, praying that the bill may not be passed into a law in its present form.

"5. That the petitions now produced and read be adopted.

"6. That the gentlemen who form the provisional committee, with power to add to their number, be appointed a committee for carrying the resolutions of this meeting into effect; and that they be authorized to take such further measures as shall appear to them necessary for the protection of the interests confided to their care."

Matters agreed on between the Solicitors for the Parties, and in behalf of their respective Clients.

"The Governors are to present a petition to the Lord Chancellor, praying that the words requiring future Governors to be of the Church of England, may be struck out of the schedule.

"The bill not to proceed to any further stage, until his Lordship shall have decided upon such petition.

"In page 39 of the printed bill, before the word 'birth,' insert 'place of,' and strike out 'qualification.'

"J. W. WHATELEY,

"WILLIAM WILLS.

"May 28, 1830."

Report, &c., of the Deputies sent to London on behalf of the Dissenters of Birmingham, &c.

"Public Office, June 4, 1830.

"The Deputies sent to London, to oppose the Free School Bill, on behalf of the Dissenters of Birmingham, being returned, and having delivered in a report of their proceedings, stating, among other matters,—

"That the Governors of the Free School had agreed to petition the Lord Chancellor for permission to strike out of the bill the clause, directing that 'no person shall be eligible to be a Governor of the school who is not a member of the Established Church of England'—which petition, there can be no doubt, his Lordship will immediately grant; and that they had likewise agreed, in the most prompt and conciliatory manner, to alter two other clauses in the bill, which appeared to admit of an interpretation unfavourable to Dissenters:—

"RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY,

"That the highly gratifying report now read be received and approved; and that the cordial thanks of the committee be presented to the gentlemen of the deputation, for the ability and zeal with which they have conducted, to a successful termination, the business entrusted to their care."

Thanks were also voted to Lord Holland, the Marquis of Lansdown, Lord Calthorpe, Francis Lawley, Esq., and other Parliamentary supporters or advisers of the petitioners; to William Smith, Esq., M. P., the Chairman, and to the Committee, of the 'Deputies appointed to protect the Civil Rights of Dissenters,' and to John Wilks, Esq., Secretary to the 'Society for the Protection of Religious Liberty.'

(Signed) **"EDWARD CORN,**

"Low Bailiff, Chairman."

Letter communicating the successful result of the opposition made by the Dissenters in Birmingham to certain parts of the Free School Bill.

"London, June 7, 1830.

"DEAR SIR,

"I beg leave to acquaint you that the petition* was heard by the Lord Chancellor to-day; and his Lordship ordered both the amendments to be made.

"Yours truly,

"J. W. WHATELEY.

"William Wills, Esq., Solicitor,
Birmingham."

Lady Hewley's Fund.

A MR. JOSEPH BLOWER, Solicitor, it appears, to the prosecutors in this suit, has taken advantage of our notice of the proceedings to advertise himself in the Congregational Magazine as a zealous Anti-Unitarian lawyer. We hope this attempt "to invite the attention" will avail him, for he describes himself as a very civil man towards his opponents, and not at all addicted to "savage hostility." We cannot, however, agree with him that the prosecutors are not responsible for the suspension of the payments to the beneficiaries of the Trust; the fact of their petitioning that the exhibitions might continue, shews that they were conscious of that respon-

sibility, and uneasy under it; and, taken together with his effort to shift the blame to the Trustees, shews some shame at the first wounds they have inflicted in their holy war. Nor can we think that Mr. B. really suspected the Trustees and their solicitors of having written, or us of having consulted them about, the remarks on this prosecution in our November number. He is welcome to our testimony to the certificate which, by this insinuation, he has obtained, that we are not their agents. And we thank him for his public admission of the fact that Lady Hewley's bequests, whatever were her own opinions, were not restricted to the Trinitarian or Calvinistic sect, but left for "godly preachers of Christ's holy gospel, and for the encouragement of the preaching of the same in poor places." If the Trustees have not conscientiously carried into effect this general and liberal instruction, let them abide the consequences. This impartiality is, we apprehend, the very head and front of their offending. However that may be, we shall not be deterred from the expression of our opinions and feelings on this, or any similar attempt, (if for the benefit of the legal profession such attempts are to be repeated,) to bring what the donors have left unrestricted, within the grasp of a party whose object is its exclusive appropriation.

* The petition of the Governors that the obnoxious clause, &c., might be withdrawn. This was the course pursued, agreeably to what had been publicly suggested in the House of Lords.

Ministerial Settlement.

The Rev. H. Hawkes has accepted an unanimous invitation to become the permanent minister of the New Unitarian Congregation in Norwich.

CORRESPONDENCE.

One of the volumes, of the non-appearance of which D—e complains, has been published several years, and was announced in the usual way.

C. H. and J. L. in our next. A "Constant Reader" (Nov. 12) is intended for insertion.

Did not J. forget that "another year" would have commenced? Will he not prefer a seasonable appearance?

ERRATUM.

Vol. IV. p. 269, col. 1, line 4, for "This," read *His*.